School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1425216

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ADVENTURING

JEROME DAVIS

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

Cen 2,50
2/28

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ADVENTURING

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL ADVENTURING

EDITED AND WITH AN INTRODUCTION
BY
JEROME DAVIS

BT
738
D37

THE CENTURY CO.
New York & London

Copyright, 1927, by
THE CENTURY CO.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

To a Family Who Love the Fun of Social Adventuring for International Friendship

Leverett, executive and mining engineer in Colorado, Oregon, California, Canada, and Alaska

Helen, promoter of better industrial conditions for women in China

Merle, social and industrial worker in Japan; world secretary of the Institute of Pacific Relations

Genevieve, pioneer in the movement for women's rights in Japan

Clara, friend of African women, and builder of their first hospital in Johannesburg, South Africa

334776

INTRODUCTION

Every true American loves adventure. This book describes some of the ways in which the individual can adventure in his home community. The message of Senator William E. Borah, for instance, grapples fearlessly with certain of the most pressing controversial problems now engaging each informed citizen of our republic. The average person who really wishes to make his life pattern square with his faith pattern will here find a whole arsenal of suggestions. The volume should also prove valuable for the minister and the social worker; material is available and waiting for the rudiments of a dozen sermons. There are concrete suggestions for securing coöperation between church members and social agencies. Several plans are outlined for tapping the reservoir of unselfish service which has too often been dammed up within the confines of church membership instead of being released to furnish the mainsprings of community action.

Book reviewers, publishers, and the superficial public often pass by on the other side of a symposium. It is so much more comfortable to drift

lazily along with one author rather than to have one's thoughts and prejudices pricked and torn by differing points of view.

In this case, the reader is getting what is almost the equivalent of a library of twenty-six original books compressed into one, and for the most part they are nowhere else available. Each of the contributors has here given in concentrated form a message which he could wish sometime to expand into a volume. In only one case has the contribution ever appeared in book form before; two others have been used in the form of addresses. In all the remaining chapters the material was specially prepared for inclusion here. Consider, for instance, the following questions, out of many which might be given; then ask where else one can find a discussion of them in a single book or even in a dozen.

1. What should be our attitude toward the socialist agitator and the pacifist in war and in peace?

2. In the twentieth century is it possible to apply the Sermon on the Mount to our daily life in New York?

3. How can the Christian personalize, dramatize, and socialize his faith in God?

4. Should a Christian be his brother's keeper in the matter of prohibition enforcement?

5. Should the church take sides with a class group?

6. Should we abolish the jail, or remake it?

7. How can the individual Christian solve the community problems of sex?

8. Is mental hygiene of value to the church member, and how?

9. What is our responsibility toward the school? toward the immigrant?

10. How can we use the love of adventure in a community plan of recreation?

The editor realizes that no final answer can be given to these questions, nor is it attempted. Suggestions have been made, and it is hoped that the mind of the reader will be stimulated to independent and creative thinking. Every thoughtful American citizen needs to think his way through to a working hypothesis about some of these questions. To neglect them means increasing injustice; to adopt the current conventional attitude of materialism is to drift silently toward disaster. Even wrong answers sincerely and honestly thought out are preferable, for they at least mean that we are thinking and that there will be some whose experiments will be a step forward toward bread, beauty, and brotherhood for all.

For the most part this volume does not attempt to dig down into those fundamental tendencies which sooner or later must make epoch-making changes in our commercial world. The volume is not aimed at this goal. It is an effort to study the practical relationship between the church, religion, the individual citizen, and social work.

The great challenge of our time is to live our faith, to apply our loyalties. The church, as the inspirer of religion, must act as a powerful Transformer, changing its current from mystical abstractions to applied dynamics. To achieve this purpose the organized churches must work with and through the organized charities.

Individual Christians have long been perplexed in their effort to live justice, truth, and mercy in the community. Here is an attempt to give us all the keenest and most convincing experience from some of the best known leaders in our national life.

The editor is under lasting obligation to those who have so generously contributed their ideas to this symposium. The volume is a practical demonstration of the far-reaching possibilities of coöperation in the literary field. No author is responsible for the opinions of another, yet each has contributed his quota to the whole. The students of Yale Divinity School really called this volume into being. It was only because no adequate challenging books covering the relationship of the Church to social work were found that I finally began to gather the contributions contained here. I desire to express my sincere appreciation to my secretary, Mrs. Barbara Molstad, for her assistance in preparing some of the biographical sketches.

Jerome Davis.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Civic Righteousness 3
William E. Borah

Practising the Sermon on the Mount 25
Harry Emerson Fosdick

The Church and Social Questions 43
Francis J. McConnell

The Changing Place of the Church 61
Edward T. Devine

How Christians Might Cooperate 73
John A. Lapp

Cooperating with Chambers of Commerce and Civic Organizations 85
Harold S. Buttenheim

The Church and Social Agencies 102
Joseph K. Hart

How the Catholic Church Does It 119
William J. Kerby

Child Dependency 135
Henry W. Thurston

Juvenile Delinquency 151
Miriam Van Waters

The Social Settlement Religion and the Church . . . 165
Graham Taylor

PAGE

Using a Case Technique 179
Frank J. Bruno

Health 193
Haven Emerson

Social Hygiene 211
Thomas W. Galloway

Mental Hygiene 229
Harrison Sacket Elliott

Law Enforcement 245
Wayne B. Wheeler

The Church and Education 259
Luther Allan Weigle

Community Recreation 277
Le Roy E. Bowman

The Young Men's Christian Association and the Churches 289
John R. Mott

The Church and Industry 305
F. Ernest Johnson

The Immigrant 319
Edward A. Steiner

The Local Jail 335
Charles N. Lathrop

Ministering to the Handicapped 349
Richard C. Cabot

Translating Christianity into the Daily Community Life 357
Jerome Davis

CIVIC RIGHTEOUSNESS

WILLIAM E. BORAH

United States Senator from Idaho

For many years one of the most prominent figures in Washington, Mr. Borah has been sincerely admired by both friends and opponents. Doubtless this is due to the independence of thought and the sincerity which characterize his utterances. As any candid observer of our government will admit, it is heartening to find a man in an elective office with so little regard for the political consequences of his attitude on any public question. Always guided by his own sense of what is morally right and beneficial to the country's best interests, he has not swerved from such a course, whether or not he has been supported by popular approval.

Although associated with the Republican party, Mr. Borah has never allowed himself to be bound by party interests, and he is widely recognized as the leader of the Progressives. He was offered and declined the Vice-Presidency of the United States.

Illinois can claim him as her native son, but Idaho is his adopted State. He has served as senator for four successive terms, beginning in 1907, and is now chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee.

His belief in government guided by righteousness rather than by expediency finds expression in his contribution to this volume.

CIVIC RIGHTEOUSNESS

Senator William E. Borah

The churches of America need to support the great basic principles for which Christ lived and died. Many of these are incorporated in the historic traditions of America. Ministers need to pioneer in creating a civic conscience which will create social righteousness. They should see to it that honest and able men are nominated for public office. After election, they can do much to encourage public servants who are courageous fighters for the right. Far from allowing politics to run itself, all their ministry should contribute to the public weal. What are some of the public issues which should command their loyalty?

First of all, we need a support of genuine freedom. Without an unfettered press, without liberty of speech, all the outward forms and structures of free institutions are a sham, a pretense—the sheerest mockery. If the press is not free, if speech is not independent and untrammeled, if the mind is shackled or made impotent through fear, it makes no difference under what form of government you live, you are a subject and not a citizen. Republics

are not in and of themselves better than other forms of government except in so far as they carry with them and guarantee to the citizen that liberty of thought and action for which they were established.

Of all times, in time of war the press should be free. That of all occasions in human affairs calls for a press vigilant and bold, independent and uncensored. Better to lose a battle than to lose the vast advantage of a free press. A free and independent press, as historic incidents show, may be of greater service than any other single feature of a great conflict.

In times of war, corruption and venality, sordidness and greed are always active, always prevalent. I know of very few exceptions. It was so in the Civil War, when the Union seemed to be going to pieces. It was true—notoriously and brazenly true—during the Spanish-American War. Men were fed on diseased food that greed might riot in its profits. Everywhere, in high places and low places, men were spying about for a chance to take advantage of the patriotic people engaged in defending the honor of their country. I know of nothing more important to a free people in time of war, in time of great stress, than a free press.

An ancient document known as the Constitution of the United States says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof or abridging the freedom of speech." Not *deny* the freedom of

speech, not *prohibit* the freedom of speech, but not ever shall Congress abridge the freedom of speech.

But there is a peculiar doctrine which has come to have recognition in this country. It was said during the late war that as soon as war was declared the Constitution of the United States was in a sense suspended, that the Congress could pass any law it saw fit to pass. At first that seemed to me to be a subject of amusement, and I still really think it is. But as a matter of fact it was seriously advocated by learned and able men, legislators, and executive departments. It was upon that theory and apparently upon that principle that many things were done during the war. For myself, I want to repudiate it once and for all. I trust that no such vicious and un-American doctrine will ever be seriously considered by the people of this country. There is only one way that you can change the Constitution of the United States or suspend any of its provisions, and that is in the same way and by the same power that made it, to wit, the people of the United States themselves in the manner pointed out by the Constitution. Every clause, every line, every paragraph, of that Great Charter obtains in time of war just the same as in time of peace. Washington was something of a soldier. Hamilton understood something of war. The framers of the Constitution had all passed through a great conflict of eight years in length. They undoubtedly understood that the republic would in all probability be called upon to

wage war in the future. Do you suppose they thought they were building a government or writing a Constitution which was to obtain during peaceful days only? They wrote a Constitution sufficient and efficient to carry on the work of peace and also to carry on war. The Constitution gives sufficient power by its own terms for the conduct of war, and none of its provisions are suspended or annulled by the declaration of war. Any other theory would be perfectly vicious. It would be to write into our very government the doctrine of the tyrants, that necessity knows no law.

Let those who think that our Constitution was made for peace and not for war turn to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and read it in full. The court says: "The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the government within the Constitution has all the powers granted to it which are necessary to preserve its existence, as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to overthrow its just authority."

The ministers of the country must uphold the Constitution. This may mean defending the right of members of the I.W.W., socialists, and labor-unions to speak and to organize.

In the next place, the church must build for peace, and this means a revolution in our attitude toward war. A belief that force must always be in the background, always be subject to call, has come to permeate the beliefs of men everywhere. It is all but universal among those who deal with international questions. Its futility for peace has been proven a thousand times, but it still prevails. There are no words to describe and no philosophy to explain this superstitious idolatry of force. Governments make treaties in which they agree, under certain conditions, to employ force, to send armies and navies, to sacrifice treasure and life, and no one stops to ask: Will the contracting powers keep their promise? who will see that they execute their pledge? It is all taken for granted.

On the other hand, when governments make treaties, or propose to make treaties, in which they agree to submit their controversies to the decision of a court and abide by the judgment thereof, immediately the question is asked: Who will enforce the judgment? where is your army and your navy to carry the decree into effect? As a matter of fact, it is precisely the same thing behind and back of both treaties—the solemn pledge of the nation, only that and nothing more. In one instance there is the honor

of the nation to send an army. In the other instance there is the honor of the nation to abide by the judgment of a court. We find no difficulty in relying upon the former pledge. We utterly distrust the latter. It is another manifestation of that wicked, persistent distrust of human nature which comes down to us from the days when governments were founded upon force and the people had no voice. You fix the machinery of government and the plans for peace, so that public opinion may operate, so that the average man and woman may have a voice, and the judgments of your courts will be respected.

As it is now, in the last analysis there is no difference between the advocates of peace and the advocates of war. They ultimately meet upon the common ground that force is the final arbiter in international affairs. Every peace scheme ends with a provision for war and an arrangement for armies and navies. Speaking at Geneva last March, the foreign secretary of the British Government declared: "Brute force is what they fear, and only brute force enlisted in their behalf will give them the security of which they feel the need." He was speaking for peace. A short time before that a noted American general publicly declared: "If for one moment you remove force as the mainstay of government, that moment the civilization of two thousand years disappears like an exploded soap-bubble." He was speaking for war.

But here you have the doctrine from both sides,

the doctrine which has lately reduced a continent to one weltering mass of human misery, still claiming to be the stay and prop of civilization, still accepted as the basis of peace and of war. Did Bernhardi claim anything different or anything more? Did Cæsar or Napoleon build upon any different theory? Does the law of the jungle rest upon any different basis? I utterly reject the doctrine that force is the mainstay of government. Unfortunately it still has its place in organized society, but it is incidental. It is subordinate to a higher and more enduring power, and should always be regarded and treated as such. The fleeing criminal and the pursuing sheriff are but an incident in the life of the countless millions whose devotion to order and obedience to law make organized society possible. We see only the criminal and the sheriff, and overlook the silent majestic force which finds expression in millions of homes and in the daily avocations of the people and through which alone society is held together. If it were not for the love and loyalty of our people to our country, this government would crumble in a night, and our army and navy would go with it.

We have reached a point where it seems to me we have no alternative. We shall either change our faith, or civilization will experience the crash which has twice before overtaken it. After two thousand years of this worship of force, after two thousand years of this teaching and of the practice which

flows from such teaching, what are the results, what are the fruits? If any one is familiar with the vernacular of hell, let him undertake to paint the picture. Human tongue is inadequate to the task. First, a debt of $350,000,000,000, resting like an eternal mortgage—for it will never be paid—upon the brain and the energy of the human family, driving men and women on to days and nights of ceaseless and fruitless toil. Nations rich, marvelously rich in national resources, now upon the very verge of bankruptcy, and still laying on like a burning lash upon the backs of their peoples heavier and still heavier burdens. Hospitals from Petrograd and Berlin to San Francisco and Peking, crowded with the diseased, the maimed, and the insane. Families broken and scattered, states dismembered, peoples oppressed, babes born prematurely old and cursed with inherited disease, communities visited with strange epidemics and incurable afflictions, and finally every government, in the face of all this, now searching for more deadly and destructive means of indiscriminate murder; these are the fruits of this worship of force, this urge for blood. I maintain that the human family cannot carry the creed. It is undermining and destroying the race. We have no alternative. We are compelled as a matter of self-preservation to reject this fetish. We must work definitely to outlaw war forever and to make it illegal.

There is another issue which is now confronting the American people. It is that of supporting law

and order, or of preaching nullification and anarchy. Here again it is a question of loyalty to the Constitution and to the nation.

Perhaps no provision of the Constitution ever went into that instrument after more consideration and more deliberation, more agitation, more discussion, than the Eighteenth Amendment. Thirty-three States prior to its adoption had established statewide prohibition; the subject had been discussed among and before the people for the last fifty years; every state legislature had adopted the principle in some form or other. Finally, the amendment came before Congress, was discussed in both bodies of Congress, went to the respective legislatures of the States, was considered by the legislatures, and ratified by all the States except two. Certainly no one can contend that this provision of the Constitution is there by accident. Certainly they cannot successfully contend that it went there without proper discussion and consideration. The amendment is there as the deliberate, expressed will and wish and purpose of the American people. It carries the same sanctity and the same force as any other provision of the Constitution. It is there, and so long as it remains there it is vital to the cause of good government, to the cause of constitutional government, and to the cause of law and order, that it be lived up to and maintained in all its integrity. There can be no more vital problem presented to a free people than the problem of whether or not they can hold

and maintain the Constitution which they have deliberately written.

What did this constitutional amendment do and propose to do? It established, in the first place, a great national policy, to wit, that intoxicating liquors should not be manufactured, sold, or transported throughout the United States, or any part of it, that they should neither be imported nor exported. Here, therefore, was a national policy declared and written into the fundamental law as the deliberate, the unmistakably expressed will and wish of the people of the United States. The question presented therefore is a greater question than that of prohibition. Important as the question of prohibition is, the question which is now presented is the enforcement of the amendment, the higher and bigger and broader question of whether we, as a free people, can maintain and enforce the provisions of the Constitution as they have been written. That involves the whole question of constitutional integrity, of constitutional morality—indeed, of the ultimate success of free government itself. Let us view it from that standpoint as we consider the question.

But the constitutional provision went further than the mere declaration of a national policy. It declared, or granted, the power to both the State and the National Government to execute and make effective that national policy. It gave concurrent power to the State and to the National Government to see that this policy was made effective. It did not leave it to

the National Government. It did not withdraw from the States the powers which they had had and lodge them in the National Government; but after declaring a national policy, it placed the obligation upon both the State and the National Government alike to enforce it.

There has been much discussion about the duty of the State under these circumstances. It is a subject about which earnest and able men may differ. But the discussion has seemed to me to proceed upon too narrow and too technical a basis. It is not alone a question of what the State is legally bound to do, or what it may be compelled to do, but what should the State, as an integral part of the American Union, and acting in the integrity and purposes of that Union, do. Certainly we cannot mandamus a State to pass a law or to execute or enforce a law. But there is an infinitely more compelling power calling the State into action, and that is the fact that the State is an integral part of the American Union. The whole purpose, the very existence of the Union requires and depends upon concerted action in carrying out the aims and purposes of the Union as expressed in the Federal Constitution. We live under two sovereignties. We seek to combine and utilize local and national interests in one grand purpose. We are endeavoring in this way to work out the great problem of representative government. Is not every State a part, and anxious to be considered a part, of that purpose? Is not every State interested and deeply

concerned in working out that problem? Is not every State bound in the most solemn way to contribute to the fullest extent of its ability to the solution of that problem? Who wants to be considered a slacker in the most sublime task ever undertaken in the affairs of government—that of demonstrating that a people may govern themselves, govern under established law and in the spirit of regulated liberty? Does any one think such a task possible of achievement, if sovereign States withdraw or withhold their most zealous support of the supreme law of the land or any part of it? Forget for a moment that the Eighteenth Amendment covers the question of prohibition and think of it only as a part of the charter under which we live and to which we owe allegiance and support, and how plainly the duty of every individual and of every State appears.

If some one thinks the Eighteenth Amendment is unwise and desires to come out before the American people and advocate taking it out of the Constitution, neither you nor I can criticize him; that is a right which he has. But so long as it is there written, so long as it is a part of it, the question of state rights can have no hearing when the question of enforcement is up for consideration. The question of state rights was fought out when it was before the state legislatures; the States, as sovereignties, said: we delegate this power and are willing to coöperate with the National Government. And it is not the part of any government or any individual representing a

State after that judgment has been rendered to say: in my opinion it encroaches upon state rights. It is a fearful doctrine which has been preached to us, this doctrine of disregarding the Constitution under the claim of state rights. It feeds lawlessness as the poison of the swamp gives the germs of disease. It is a libel on the whole theory of the American Union. It is an indictment of the whole superb scheme of 1789.

There is a well-organized movement in this country against a class of people who, it is said, are unfriendly to our form of government and our Constitution, a class of people who are designated as Reds and radicals. Those who are uneasy about the rights of property as guaranteed by the Constitution are greatly interested in this work. They have a thorough organization dealing with the subjects of anarchy, communism, and Bolshevism, and those things which they feel undermine our government and destroy the stability of our institutions. I thoroughly sympathize with their desires to inculcate respect for and loyalty to our institutions. I think you cannot spend too much time in educating the American people in the worth of the institutions under which we live and of the value of our form of government. A man who comes to our shores and openly defies our Constitution is a most unworthy creature. But he is not so reprehensible, so much to be criticized, it seems to me, as the man who has been reared in this country, who has had an oppor-

tunity to know the beneficent worth of our institutions, who has witnessed the value through all these years of the law under which our Government lives, and who still disregards or defies some particular provision or amendment because it runs counter to his personal interests or personal views or personal vices. Let me say here: not all of them, of course, but many of those people of property, many of those who are much agitated over the question of foreign propaganda and its undermining effect upon our Constitution, are the most pronounced, insistent, and persistent violators of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution. The hotbed, the scouting, noisy rendezvous of lawlessness, of cynical defiance to the Eighteenth Amendment, is among those of social standing, of large property interests, and in the wealthier homes. Without their patronage, their protection, and their example, the bootlegger could easily be brought within the control of the law. I repeat again, I am thoroughly in sympathy with their anxiety over foreign influence upon the Constitution, but I must say in all sincerity that just to the extent that they undermine respect for the Constitution, respect for law, by the lives which they lead and the examples which they set and by the influence which they exert against the Eighteenth Amendment, just in that proportion, to that extent, they are also undermining those provisions of the Constitution which protect property. The Eighteenth Amendment is in the Constitution by the same

authority as the Fifth Amendment, which throws its protection around life and property. The undermining of one undermines the other. The Eighteenth Amendment is in the Constitution by the same authority and with the same sanctity as the Fourteenth Amendment, which stands between the State and the property-holder against all assaults by the State. That which undermines the Eighteenth Amendment undermines the Fourteenth Amendment. The Red sits in his darkly lighted room around his poorly laden table and denounces those provisions of the Constitution placed there to protect property. The White sits in his brilliantly lighted room about his richly laden table and defies or denounces the provisions of the Constitution placed there in the belief they would protect the home. I leave it to all good citizens whether it is not true that both are traveling the road of lawlessness, both sowing the seeds of destruction, both undermining the whole fabric of law and order.

Let these people of influence who insist upon satisfying their appetites against the expressed will of the American people understand that they cannot have their property secure, that they cannot have their homes safe, that they cannot protect their wealth and those things which they deeply cherish, if they continue by their examples and by their precepts to sow the seeds of lawlessness throughout the United States.

We all know from a review of history that law-

lessness is the insidious disease of republics. It is the one great malady against which every true patriot will ever be on guard. It is but a short step from the lawlessness of the man of means, who scouts some part of the fundamental law because forsooth it runs counter to his wishes, to the soldier who may be called into the street to protect property, but who, taking counsel of his sympathies, fraternizes with the mob. The great question, therefore, before the American people now is, not that of prohibition, because that as a policy has been settled. The supreme question is: after we have determined as a people upon prohibition, whether we have the moral courage, the high determination, and the unwavering purpose to enforce that which we have written into the Constitution.

In these anxious days, almost every one has a plan or a scheme for the betterment of conditions—for the adjustment, or readjustment, of things which seem so strangely, so persistently, out of joint. But if I were going to inscribe a banner under which to arouse the dispirited and discouraged millions of brave and loyal citizens, I would precede all other inscriptions, plans, and pledges with that of obedience to the law because it is a law. There are hundreds and thousands of people, with the number daily increasing, who would like to feel safe in their persons, safe in their workshops and homes, who would like to feel that justice can be administered

and laws enforced, and that the provisions of our Constitution which protect property are no more sacred than the provisions which protect human rights and moral values. What shall it profit that leaders have planned and patriots have striven and sacrificed through all these years if we have come at last to the fearful, accursed creed that constitutions are to be disregarded, laws to be evaded or defied, and, finally, that we are to accept and put in practice the vicious and destructive and savage rule that every man is a law unto himself? The bed-rock, the granite formation, upon which great civilizations and powerful governments are built is obedience to the law. That is the beginning and the end of all good government. Without it we cannot hope for happiness and prosperity at home or for prestige and power abroad. We have arrived at the time when we can afford to, when indeed we must, invoke the old virtues, appeal again to the simple precepts of government, and make obedience to law a cardinal tenet of our political faith. We do not need a new faith. We need the simplicity, the directness, and the self-surrender of the old. We need to preach the creed of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln with a tongue of fire throughout the land. We need to have constitutional morality declared as was the gospel of old to the high and to the low, for against this neither "things present nor things to come shall prevail." You can no more leave

behind the fundamental principles of right and justice, of respect for and obedience to law, without paying the frightful penalty, than a people, however high and strong in their material power, can abandon the simple pronouncements of Sinai without sinking into utter and hopeless degradation.

Some time ago, down in the great commonwealth of Kentucky, I visited the place where Nancy Hanks, prematurely old and broken, nursed and nurtured and cared for the most extraordinary child yet born under the American flag. As you stoop and enter that hovel and reflect, as you will, upon the squalor and the wretchedness which a century ago environed its improvident inmates, and then call up in memory the glory which came out of that hovel, the glory which has since filled the earth, you will feel a deeper reverence and a stronger love for these institutions of ours than you ever felt before. There will come to you and upon you a feeling which both humbles and makes you brave; a yearning to know what is to be the ultimate destiny of a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." And when you lingeringly and reluctantly come to take your leave of this humble, this appealing place, enriched and inspired with the sensations and the fancies of the brief hour, and turn your face again toward the real world with its fearful unrest, its turbulent, distressful conditions, you will find yourself involuntarily saying: Give us again leaders of courage, men of vision, men who believe that right

makes might, men with faith in the efficiency, the strength, the permanency, and the ultimate triumph of this blessed old republic.

I believe in Christianity and in the churches of every denomination. I believe their supreme task, their supreme opportunity, is to help build the character life of the nation.

PRACTISING THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

PASTOR, PARK AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH, NEW YORK

Dr. Fosdick is undoubtedly one of the greatest and most widely known religious leaders of our time. His books and sermons are familiar to nearly every Christian who is interested in an intelligent study of religion. Over a million copies of his writings have already found their way into American homes, and translations have been made into twelve different languages, representing the principal countries of the world. Probably no other minister of the gospel is exerting a more widespread influence upon modern religious thought.

In his present pastorate at the Park Avenue Baptist Church in New York, Dr. Fosdick is an outstanding exponent of liberalism and tolerance, welcoming to his church all followers of Christ, whether or not they wish to ally themselves with the Baptist denomination.

After graduating from the theological seminary in 1904, he was pastor of the First Baptist Church in Montclair, New Jersey, for eleven years, and of the First Presbyterian Church in New York for six years, at the same time teaching in Union Theological Seminary and also spending considerable time in travel and lecturing abroad. Included in his foreign work have been ministerial service in Great Britain and France during the World War, addresses to missionary conferences in China and Japan in 1921, and preaching throughout England and Scotland in 1924. During his sabbatical leave of absence from Union Theological Seminary two years ago he spent ten months abroad, chiefly in Egypt and Palestine.

PRACTISING THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

Let us raise with ourselves the question as to whether we Christians are disciples of Jesus or even seriously propose to be, or whether in our religious life we have largely substituted something else altogether. To be sure, we may call this substituted article Christianity, but, for all that, it can be something very different from the serious endeavor to put into practice the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. We may be Christians in the sense that we believe a theological creed accepted as Christian, or belong to a church that is called Christian, or practise rituals that have been associated with Christianity. But to be Christian in the sense of being disciples of Jesus, seriously endeavoring to live his way of life, is another matter altogether.

Let us, then, question ourselves about our inward attitude toward the Sermon on the Mount. What adjectives would you naturally choose to describe its admonitions, all the way from considering the birds of the air and the flowers of the field and being

correspondingly without anxiety, to turning the other cheek when you are smitten on one, or loving your enemies and doing them good? Would not some say at once that these injunctions are ideal, not to say saintly? Would not others go further and say they are visionary and impractical? And perhaps some would go further and say they are wrong and that it would disrupt human society really to practise them. One independent preacher even said that the Sermon on the Mount ought to be called the Sarcasm on the Mount.

Turn, then, to the adjective that Jesus uses about his own injunctions. Dr. Moffatt has given us a suggestive rendering of that first verse of the final paragraph, in which the Master brings his great discourse to its conclusion: "Every one who listens to these words of mine and acts upon them will be like a sensible man who built his house on rock." Of all adjectives that would occur to most of us to apply to the Sermon on the Mount, surely the last is "sensible."

We may well at the beginning put ourselves in the place of those who find difficulty with the Sermon on the Mount and agree with them on one point. We cannot always take Jesus literally. Jesus does not always take his own words literally. He said, "Judge not, that ye be not judged," but you have only to read the twenty-third chapter of Matthew's Gospel, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" to see how severely he could judge. He said,

"Be not anxious," but on the threshold of his tragedy he cried, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say?" and in the agony in the Garden he prayed that this cup might if possible pass from him. He said, "Whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," but when at last he was smitten, though in patient silence he bore the contumely and brutality of the Roman soldiers, there is nothing to indicate that he literally turned the other cheek.

The Master did not always take his own words literally because, for one thing, nobody in the Orient takes anybody literally. A native Syrian, born a little way north of where Jesus lived, says that when he goes to visit an old friend, his host, expansive with genial hospitality, addresses him as follows: "This house is yours; you can burn it if you wish. My children also are at your disposal; I would sacrifice them all for your pleasure." Does he mean it literally? Of course not. But he does mean it seriously.

Miss Maude Royden of London has rightly pointed out that there is a great difference between those two ideas. It is one thing to take Jesus literally. It is another to take him seriously. And there are too many people who, because they see the obvious fact that you cannot always take him literally, are trying to escape the deep obligation to take him seriously.

He said it is harder for a rich man to get into the Kingdom of Heaven than it is for a camel to go

through a needle's eye. Take that figure literally and it is absurd. But it is to be taken seriously. Every man with money would better take it seriously. All man's social history is a commentary on the truth of it. It is not easy to carry a full cup.

He said, "Whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also." Do that literally and see how foolish you will look. But it is to be taken seriously. Generally that passage is interpreted to indicate the way a man should act when he is in a fight. But when we fight do we slap each other on the cheek? Are we little girls that we fight like that? Smiting on the cheek is not easily made a symbol for a fight; it is a symbol for an insult. It corresponds with thrusting out the tongue or thumbing the nose. "Whosoever insults thee in one way, let him insult thee in another"—as a man grows older and experiences a little what it means to be insulted, the more he is impressed with the fact that one who acts upon that principle is a sensible man.

We said that the Master did not always take his own words literally, but surely he took them seriously. He said, "Love your enemies," and he meant it. To be sure, it was not a literal law that made him soft and prevented severe denunciations of men's woes and wrongs when the occasion demanded it, but you have only to climb Calvary and hear from the victim of that central cross prayer for the men who put him there to see that Jesus, an Oriental,

often speaking in hyperbole and, not taking his own words literally, meant what he said seriously.

With this understanding of the Sermon on the Mount, let us turn to look at it, and consider certain propositions which indicate that Jesus' adjective "sensible" is justified.

For one thing, the most sensible thing that the church of Christ could do to-day would be to rediscover Jesus and his way of life. Look at this strange salmagundi that we call Christianity, that, expressed in innumerable rituals and creeds, one runs across as he traverses the Western World from New York to Jerusalem. In what sharp contrast with that elaborate sophisticated development does Jesus' way of living stand. For while the principles of the Sermon on the Mount run deep they can be swiftly summarized:

In dealing with ourselves, absolute genuineness within, so that not only will we not murder but we will not hate, not only will we not commit adultery but we will reverence too much the sanctities of personality to propose it, that we will not require an oath for our word is as good as our bond, and if ever on the branches of our lives hangs apparent fruit it will not be like the tinsel on Christmas trees, tied on for show, but a spontaneous expression of good life within. In dealing with ourselves, absolute genuineness.

In dealing with others, absolute good-will, good-will so unqualified that no one's ill treatment will ever

spoil its quality or reduce it to retaliation, so that, like the God of nature, sending his rain and sun on just and unjust, we will show good-will to grateful and ungrateful, to the friendly and the hostile, and never allow any one's ill-will to reduce us to the level of hating back. In dealing with others, absolute good-will.

In dealing with God, absolute trust, so that our religion will not mean praying on street corners or thinking that we can be heard for our much speaking, but the serene experience of an inward fellowship with the unseen Friend, so that, giving ourselves primarily to seeking his will upon earth, we shall be tranquil about lesser matters—"Round our restlessness, His rest."

In dealing with ourselves, inner genuineness, with our fellows utter good-will, with God perfect confidence—that, in brief, is discipleship to Jesus.

Well, we have gone a long way from that in Christianity. Look about you and see what goes under the name of Christian. The history of a spiritual revelation, springing up fresh in some lofty soul, is like that of a mountain spring. The pure water flows down among the haunts of men; societies grow up along its course; they use it to drive their mills, they pour their refuse into it, they turn it from its natural channels; it becomes unlovely, undrinkable, unclean, and at last empties polluted into the sea. Why must it always happen so?

Not long ago we were helping to celebrate the

anniversary of St. Francis of Assisi. There was a soul through whom God burst in a revelation of light and life upon the souls of men. Says the historian, "Not since Christ has any one else inflamed the human heart and fired the imagination to so great a degree as St. Francis. And yet," wrote the historian, "within a century after the founding of the Franciscan order it became a disgrace." That is the tragedy, that if St. Francis had come back, even within a century, he would have had to insist that as for him he was not a Franciscan.

So has it happened to Jesus and his movement. His message, gathering alien elements even from the minds of the first disciples, went out into that ancient world. Greek philosophy took hold upon it, erected enormous intellectual superstructures on the basis of it, made a colossal orthodoxy out of it. The Greek mystery religions took hold upon it. Long before, they had practised magical sacraments of baptism and sacred meals to imbue their devotees with immortality. They took the simple rituals that spontaneously had sprung up in Palestine and made magical sacraments out of them. The Roman Empire took hold upon it, became the mold for the church's organization, until within the falling scaffolding of the imperial state the church stood forth absolute, infallible, tremendous.

Will you say now that Protestantism redeemed the Christian movement? Well, does it look that way? Let us cease our foolish idealization of Prot-

estantism. Magnificent were some of those great souls who joined in that fight for freedom, but, after all, the Protestant Reformation was a half-way affair. It left dogmatism almost more accentuated than it was before. Said Martin Luther, "He who does not believe my doctrine is sure to be damned." It took the old world order that at least had had the ideal of unity and broke it up into separate nations, each with its own state church, and so helped to lay the foundations of that spectacle of disrupted Christianity and triumphant nationalism that is the major problem of the modern world. It took the old church that at least had the ideal of unity and broke it up into multitudinous little sects so bitter-spirited that many a deeply religious man, like Ruskin, has turned at last on Christianity because of it. "A little squeaking idiot," wrote Ruskin with impatience, "was preaching to an audience of seventeen old women and three louts that they were the only children of God in Turin; and that all the people outside the chapel and that all the people in the world out of sight of Monte Viso, would be damned."

Is it not the plain truth that if Jesus had come back any time after he left, with his way of living, seeking disciples who would actually try his principles out, one of the chief obstacles that he would have faced would have been Christians? It was not an enemy of the church, but a consecrated missionary in India, who recently exclaimed, "We are inoculating people with just enough dead germs of Chris-

tianity to make them immune to the real thing." Aye, forty-odd million folks in the United States calling themselves Christians, inoculated with just enough of the dead germs of Christianity, so that, as one can plainly see from the estate of private character and social life, multitudes are immune from the real thing.

The Sermon on the Mount not sensible? There isn't anything half so sensible the church could do as to go back and rediscover Jesus and his basic principles of life. He is the one great asset that Christianity possesses. The Christian movement has been bad enough but not altogether bad. Once in a while it has been glorious, so glorious that the best hopes of the world yet are to be found in Christianity, and wherever it has been glorious this one thing has happened: somebody has rediscovered Jesus. Wherever in the history of Christendom there has been a vital reformation that even for a little time has lifted up the church to be a cleansing and transforming agency in human society, there at the heart of it somebody has rediscovered Jesus.

In Roman Catholicism it may have been St. Francis in humility serving the lowliest and the lost and leaving his radiant spot of beauty at the heart of the thirteenth century. But you couldn't have walked with him a week without seeing that what had happened there was a man who had refound Jesus and his way of life.

In Protestantism it may have been John Wesley

turning his back upon the dry-as-dust formalism of the English Christianity of his time, going out from the sedate edifices of the church to preach to numberless hungry souls upon the open hillsides, but you couldn't have watched him starting the reformation, the consequences of which are not over yet, without seeing that what had happened there was a rediscovery of Jesus.

And when, just behind us, men like Rauschenbusch started their call for a social reformation, showing us that six days in the week we were doing things that denied what we said on Sunday, there at the center of their movement, the source of its power and the secret of its passion, was the rediscovery of Christ.

Is anything like that, according to our power and measure, to happen among us? There is no use trying to present to this new generation that vast amalgam of diverse elements that history has lumped together and called Christianity. They will not have it, and they are right. But to present Christ himself and his way of life—that is another matter. There is no use trying to present to the non-Christian world our Western sectarianism and our Western theologies that have associated themselves with the historic development of the Christian movement. They will not have them, and they are right. But to present to them Christ himself and his way of life—that is another matter. If it comes hard from a Christian, will you take it from a Hindu? "Never

before," says a great Hindu, "never before have so many earnest minds of all races and creeds turned to him for light and guidance in perplexities . . . And though to-day Christianity but feebly reflects the spirit of its Master, the personality of the Master himself stands before the world in compelling grandeur." If any church will listen to these words of Christ and act upon them, it will be a sensible church built upon rock.

Let us push our thought a stage further. The most sensible thing that Western civilization could do to-day would be to rediscover Jesus and his way of life. So often, when folk think of the conflict between Christianity and antichristianity, they think of it in theological terms: God versus no-God. In that and similar propositions moving in the intellectual realm, they think the crucial conflict lies between Christ and Antichrist. Such problems are important. But I am sure the deepest conflict between Christianity and antichristianity does not lie there. The deepest conflict is between two ways of living.

Nietzsche, I should suppose, is the most outspoken and impressive representative of the antichristian life, but while we use his name let us remember that the principles for which he stood are age-long and that from the days of ancient Greece what we might call Nietzscheanism has had its exponents. This, in brief, is what Nietzsche would say: This world belongs to the strong; not only does might make right, but might is right; Christianity

with its ideal of care for the weak is a delusion concocted by the weak to prevent the strong from the rightful use of their own strength for themselves. It is an inversion of all true values, says Nietzsche, that the strong should care for the weak; let the weak serve the strong; let them be fertilizer, even, to make rich the soil out of which the superman may grow; humility is vice, pride is virtue; let the mighty man glory in his might and use it as he will. And as for Christianity, said Nietzsche, it is "the one great curse, the one great spiritual corruption."

There you have the very opposite of the Sermon on the Mount. There you have the crucial conflict between Christ and Antichrist. On the one side, this doctrine: we that are strong ought to squeeze the weak into our cups and drink their blood like wine to make us stronger still. And on the other this doctrine: we that are strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak and not to please ourselves. Take a look at the world. Who wins? Nietzsche or Christ?

Take note that in our Western World we have given Nietzscheanism a long, fair chance. In our business, in our industrial expansion, in our imperialism, in our national policies, in our Nordic myth beating ourselves on our chest and calling ourselves the superior race, we have given Nietzscheanism a long, fair chance. And in these recent years we have seen one climactic outburst and exhibition of it. Do you like it? Do you think that it is sensible?

The last war ruined more reputations than any

other catastrophe in history. Who got out of this war with an undamaged reputation? Did Mars, the god of war? We used to say fine things about him when I was young, that Mars ran a school of manly virtue, that he must come occasionally to tone up the spirits of the nations, that like a thunder-storm he healthily cleared the air. Mars came out of the last war with a damaged repute. He left the world half devastated, not only materially, but morally, and many a year we shall be reaping the miserable harvest of his lamentable sowing. Who again in his senses will trust Mars for service?

Did science come out with an undamaged reputation? We used to say fine things about science and the way it was going to save the world. In 1912 an eminent American professor said this: "To-day we have no fear of war, famine, pestilence, or failing resources. The advance of knowledge has safeguarded men from all those evils." He said that in 1912. I wonder what he thinks know. Marvelous have been the gifts of science to the hands of men, but that creates the problem; it does not solve it. Under the Nietzschean philosophy every gift of science will be used to destroy, not build. As another has put it, Science is mounting man upon a bigger horse than he knows how to ride. So far as being a savior of the world is concerned, science came out with a damaged name.

Did progress come out with an undamaged reputation? How we used to trust in it, this automatic

escalator of evolutionary betterment that was to lift us ever and ever to higher things! In every intelligent mind this last catastrophe destroyed that fairy-tale of inevitable progress. I have recently walked over the graves of ancient empires, Egypt, Tyre, Babylon, Greece, and Rome, which practised the Nietzschean philosophy. Their ghosts rise up to haunt our Western World. Progress came out with a badly damaged reputation.

Who did come out from this catastrophe with an unsullied name? Not Mars, not science, not progress. Did nationalism? It is a new doctrine, in the modern form that we know it in to-day, this idea that each nation is a separate, isolated, absolute unit and that it must play its selfish game against all the other separate, isolated, absolute units. Before a man calls that sensible, let him take full and just account of where it is bringing us in this generation where, long ago, all the major interests of humankind became international.

Has even Christianity come out of this last war with undamaged repute? Upon the contrary, with a name badly smirched. Five hundred and seventy-six million people claiming to be Christians—see what we did to each other! Conventional Christianity and real Nietzscheanism—that is the spectacle we presented to the world.

Where will you find us an undamaged reputation? Not Mars, not science, not progress, not nationalism, not Christianity. I know but one: Jesus. Noth-

ing has happened to discredit his way of life. Everything has happened to make it shine more than ever before, like a beacon across stormy seas. On how many people, even hard-minded folk, must it have dawned from time to time that perhaps, after all, he is right.

Recall what George Bernard Shaw says. You do not go to George Bernard for sentimental opinions. "I am ready to admit," he said, "that after contemplating the world and human nature for nearly sixty years I see no way out of the world's misery but the way which would have been found by Christ's will, if he had undertaken the work of a modern practical statesman." "Though we crucified Christ on a stick, he somehow managed to get hold of the right end of it, and if we were better men, we might try his plan."

This is the conclusion of the matter. It would not be merely ideal, it would not be merely saintly, it would be sensible for the church and civilization to rediscover him and his way of life. Would it not be sensible for you and me then? Go down almost any New York street and watch them building. They go down to bed-rock for their foundations. But watch the people who live upon the street. How many of them are building upon rock? No, come closer home, my fellow-Christians. What about your lives and mine? How many of us have been just enough inoculated with the dead germs of Christianity so that we are immune to the real thing? A min-

ister in New York tells me that lately, while talking with one of his prominent parishioners, the man broke out in an impassioned confession. He said: "I have been a member of the church for all the twenty-five years since I was baptized. Why hasn't anything vital ever happened to me?" How many in any church would say that: church members twenty-five years—why hasn't anything vital happened to us? And nothing vital will happen until back behind formal, conventional Christianity, we go to Christ at the heart of it. Christ is Christianity—all of Christianity that matters much. To know him, to be his disciples, to take him seriously, to practise his way of life, is the hope of the church and of civilization and of us who would be members of that band of transfigured men whom the world cannot tame!

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS

Francis J. McConnell

Bishop, Methodist Episcopal Church

Prophetic inspirer of the social evangel, Bishop McConnell is known throughout the length and breadth of America as a champion of social justice. His career has been a steady upward climb in both influence and opportunity.

After graduating from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1894, he was pastor in West Chelmsford, Massachusetts, until 1897; in Newton Upper Falls, 1897–99; Ipswich, 1899–1902; Harvard Street, Cambridge, 1902–03; New York Avenue, Brooklyn, 1903–09. He was president of De Pauw University from 1909 to 1912, and since that time has been bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Bishop McConnell has been president of the Religious Education Association, and he was one of the Commission of Inquiry which prepared and issued *The Interchurch World Movement Report on the Steel Strike of* 1919, which finally resulted in the abolition of the iniquitous twelve-hour day by the United States Steel Corporation.

Among his books are: *Religious Certainty,* 1910; *Christian Focus,* 1911; *The Increase of Faith,* 1912; *Personal Christianity,* 1914; *Understanding the Scriptures,* 1917; *Democratic Christianity,* 1919; and *The Christlike God,* 1927.

One of the hopeful signs in American life is that such a leader of prophetic vision and social passion can still hold the place which has been accorded to Bishop McConnell.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS

FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL

It requires only a superficial glance at church history to see at least one great contrast between pre-Reformation and post-Reformation times. In the old days before Luther, the church claimed and exercised the right of putting forth its authority in all realms of human activity. The pope even dared to tell kings the causes for which they might go to war with one another, and the conditions under which the fighting was to be carried on. He even thought of himself as possessing the right to declare to warring kings when their combats should cease. The church set the weight of its authority upon all educational processes whatever. It laid down the principles which were to govern scientists in their investigations and in the publication of their discoveries. The church went even into the marketplace and, with its theory of the just price, ruled as perhaps the most effective factor there.

Soon after the Reformation got well under way, the church, or the churches, found the fields of their direct activities rapidly shrinking. International re-

lationship became a realm by itself. Education was increasingly secularized. Business began more and more earnestly to insist that it could not be expected to tolerate any ecclesiastical interference. The results of this diminution of the sphere of activities for the church are now apparent on every hand. International relationships have long been looked upon as no-man's-land, so far as any commonly recognized moral and spiritual principles are concerned. Education has gone its own way far from the old paths. The realm of business has developed its own standards and codes, with the self-interests of the various parties to any and all transactions the chief factors in the field of view. Industrially society has developed for itself a system of philosophy and a code of ethics in which there is little place for anything suggestive of the religious interest, or for any altruistic scheme of morals.

There are those who tell us that this outcome is just what it should be—that the Reformation transferred the center of religious interest to the soul of the individual where it rightly belongs, that the main purpose of the church should be to develop this inner personal spiritual life. We have often heard it said that all that the world needs of religion is the development of this individual devotion. Leaders of churches and leaders of industry have time and again practically united in the declaration that, if we could have all men individually converted to religion, the problems of industry and all other large social ques-

tions would speedily solve themselves. If we could get all men converted to righteousness as individuals, the social frictions and differences would forthwith cease.

The events of the past few years, however, have raised in our minds a suspicion that there is something faulty in this reasoning. The world has just come through a stupendous war in which religious motives were more definitely invoked than ever before, and upon a wider scale than ever before, in the history of civilization. Every fighting nation looked upon its own cause as blessed of God, and war leaders in every land sought to develop the religious mood in their soldiers for the sake of making them better fighters. One of the grittiest militarists I have ever known once urged me to preach with all my power the doctrine of personal immortality to the young men of the present day, avowing that such preaching would necessarily make the young men better fighters. So far as war is concerned, the more religious men become in the narrowly personal sense, the worse off we are; for if religion has to do with the inner spirit and does not question our instinct to fight, the religious interest can be harnessed to any cause, no matter how socially harmful, and be made to fight for that cause. The plight is not much better in the realm of business. If religion consists merely in a round of closely personal duties, the believer can become more intense within that little round at the same time that he becomes more

thoroughly a partizan of an evil system in the industrial world.

Discerning churchmen, however, have long since begun to see that the overemphasis on the individual aspects of religion and the neglect of the broader aspects are perilous, so that there is throughout Protestant Christendom to-day an increasing demand that all phases of human activity be brought into subjection to the spirit of Christ. We all know that we cannot go back to the pre-Reformation ages. In those days church authorities could enforce their demands by threat of excommunication, or even by some milder form of ecclesiastical discipline. Nobody desires to-day any such organization of Protestantism as would give churches the right to exercise authority directly by decree, or by any kind of official enactment in the settlement of industrial issues. Nevertheless it is increasingly clear that the church has a responsibility in social fields. We mean, by such responsibility, more than just holding on high the human ideals. Of course it is not possible for a church to proclaim the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man without sooner or later starting revolutions on their courses. The hearers of such doctrines sometimes show a greater willingness to carry the doctrines out to their practical implications in society than do the preachers of the doctrines themselves. Very possibly we could write quite an interesting history of revolutions that have been started by such unintended and unintentional

preaching. Any one can see, however, how far this falls short of a discharge of the full responsibility of the church which calls itself by the name of Christ.

One of the commoner remarks of the industrial leader advises us that the church, as such, should not attempt to speak upon any concrete detail of industrial procedure. There is considerable foundation in reason for this advice. It would be absurd for any body of church officials to try to tell industrial leaders very minutely how to carry on their work. There is a technical aspect in every phase of industry, and the technique can be mastered only by the expert. Still it is possible for the industrialist to take refuge behind this admitted authority of the expert, and to denounce the church for ill advised interference when such interference may not be at all ill advised. For example, there is one phase of industrial life at the present time about which employers are not as well informed as are ministers in industrial communities. I refer to the temper of the laboring groups. Any one who has had any conversation with employers of labor—I mean employers upon a large scale—knows how ignorant such employers are likely to be as to the thought and feeling of the wage-earners with whom they are dealing. This is especially true with employers who have, as they put it, risen from the ranks. In such cases the rising from the ranks took place far in the past, under conditions utterly different from those of a later day. Moreover the leader who has thus risen has done

so by a power of survival and conquest which other men have lacked, and this difference between himself and the others is an almost insurmountable barrier to any complete mutual understanding. One wise saw which the successful industrialist is forever quoting is that there is always room at the top. There would not be this room, of course, if more laborers possessed the particular climbing or surviving power that marks the successful captain of industry. Any minister dealing with the laboring class in an industrial neighborhood knows more intimately the disappointments and the heartburnings and the enmities of those who cannot get a chance to climb the ladder than can any man who has himself made the victorious ascent. It requires only the slightest familiarity with the utterances of employing classes in the United States to detect an ignorance, amounting almost to illiteracy, on the part of such classes concerning labor problems which they think they understand better than any one else. Ministers, whose services are rendered year in and year out to the laboring groups, constitute a better source of information as to the temper of those groups than can the industrial leaders; a better source than all the agencies of whatever sort, whether welfare workers or spies, employed by the industrial leaders.

Because, then, of its superior opportunity to reach and understand groups of workers, the church ought to look upon itself as commissioned to speak forth concerning industrial problems. Moreover the

church ought to be interested in such messages for the sake of saving its own soul. The church is in the world. Its organizations of official laymen are composed of the same human beings who on week-days are meeting in other circles, circles which may largely determine the social policies of a community. Without any intention on the part of such laymen, or of the ministers who associate with the laymen, they carry the spirit of modern industry into the very air which the church breathes. Now we are coming to see that the most potent fallacies in all thinking come, not out of the assumptions which we consciously make, but of those of which we are unconscious. A thinker has attained to quite unusual ripeness of intellect when he is able to recognize and take account of assumptions which for a long time he has not detected. The fact itself that he recognizes assumptions commonly unrecognized, renders his thinking safer, even if he still continues to reason upon the assumptions. So with the church. If we can recognize the play of forces which do not ordinarily work under the full light of our understanding, we are on the path to safety, even if we cannot nullify the working of such forces. By the very fact that we recognize that they are present, we have put ourselves on guard.

There is little direct attempt to-day by industrial leaders inside church organizations to control the pulpits to the advantage of our industrial type of society. Of course the radical social agitators will

have it that pulpits are purposely opened to the men who will defend the existing system, and purposely closed to the men who will voice discontent against that system. After long observations of the workings of ecclesiastical organizations, I am confident that no such deliberate intent is a considerable factor in the opening or closing of pulpits. The danger is much deeper and subtler. If a minister shows signs of a tendency to criticize modern business methods, or the established social system, opposition indeed forthwith develops, but it seldom takes the form of direct criticism of the preacher's utterances. All sorts of objections to the minister, having apparently little to do with his economic views, begin to arise at once. He is discovered to be not quite theologically sound. Or his sermons are falling below his accustomed standard, not showing the usual marks of careful preparation. Or there are some minor traits in his personal bearing which offend the so-called best people. His voice has become raucous, or badly modulated. I repeat that the worst of all this is that it is so desperately sincere. The objectors would not admit to themselves that the economic motive is driving them, whereas any detached observer can see that, all unconsciously to the objectors themselves, the economic force is playing the villain's rôle. I am reminded of a devoted brother whom I once knew, a man of vast possessions and a deep piety within a limited personal sphere, who objected to any pulpit discussion of the present-day social system

because such discourse somehow did not make him feel "near Jesus." This good man's spirit was typical of that of hosts of persons, consciously and intentionally sincere, who are at the mercy of impulses whose sources they do not themselves suspect. Like certain other sincere persons of the olden days, they wist not what spirit they are of.

Even where this atmosphere inside a church does not lead to outspoken criticism of a pulpit utterance, the danger may be acute from the ability of the minister inevitably to sense what features of his utterance are meeting the approval of his people. In the long run preaching is, to an unsuspected degree, determined by those who listen to the sermons. The listening of congregations is a selective force which, working through the months and years, draws out of the preacher the messages which seem best fitted to the congregation. Here again the minister must be carefully on guard. He may mistake pleasing the people for ministering to them. Just by adapting his message to what seems to him to be the needs of his flock, he may be betraying the higher truth. Of course we must not forget that in any denomination there are scores of ministers who render useful service by dealing with the commoner human needs of their parishioners—relations of human beings to one another as members of a family, or as constituents of the narrower neighborhood circles. These parishioners have their human burdens, to be borne day after day. The amount of drudgery undergone year

in and year out in any ordinary community amounts in the end to a huge item to be set down to humanity's credit. Any minister who helps his fellow-men bear this drudgery is worthy of praise. It is possible, however, for those who are most useful in this type of helping men bear their burdens to preach a gospel which is socially harmful, and thus for these helpers to become in the end rather doubtful aids in the bringing in of the Kingdom of God. I happen to be a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church. I yield to none in my admiration of the achievement of the early followers of Wesley in proclaiming a gospel which spread a new sky over the dull earth of the common mind in England in the eighteenth century. Men whose backs and hearts were broken by burdens grievous to be borne felt the burdens roll away under the announcement of the good news of a heavenly country which could be entered at last by the humblest of the workers on earth. Still, we must face a reëstimate of the significance of this preaching in the England of Wesley's day. I think there can be little doubt that studies like those of Mr. and Mrs. Hammond in *The Town Laborer* are making it evident that the early Methodist preaching was one-sided, and tended to make workers submissive in hardships where they should have shown a spirit of revolt. Some consider it high praise to say of Methodism that it saved England from the French Revolution, or a revolution like that of France. I think I see the element of soundness in

this statement, but I am not at all sure that the statement itself is very high praise. For if England could have had a little more of the temper of the French Revolution, with that temper stripped of its brutality, the result would have been better for England. In the Chartist struggle, Methodism, and the other religious bodies also, did little to their credit.

We must recognize, then, that churches breathe the social atmosphere in which they exist. They cannot escape breathing that atmosphere, but they have a manifest duty to recognize the fact that they are breathing the atmosphere, and to guard themselves against its poisons.

Coming to more specific duties of the church in relation to the social order of a given time, let us remind ourselves of the value of official pronouncements by the church. If any one doubts the force of such pronouncements he ought to be placed for a season in any position where he can hear what the upholders of established systems say when they read the utterances. We may be as severe as we please about the distinction between an official utterance of a church, and the words and deeds of the members of that church as individuals; but there is no gainsaying the fact that such utterances have a value in shaping public opinion. For example, we shall probably always have to recognize that in war-time the churches must leave the individual free to act according to his own conscience when his government

calls him to arms, and must refuse utterly to pass any sentence of condemnation whatsoever upon any individual thus going forth to battle. Still, if the churches officially even kept silent on a war, declining officially to bless it, they would themselves strike the deadliest blow at war which could possibly be launched; for the masses of mankind can hardly be prevailed upon to lay down their lives in battle except for causes which their religious leaders have baptized as holy. So with social wrongs. In a slaveholding land, if there were such to-day, it would be of immense value to have a church officially pronounced against slavery, even if the majority of that church were, as individuals, slaveholders. This would not mean that the church was hypocritical. It would simply mean that the church, in its official capacity, had attained to a higher moral point of view than had its individual members, or that the church as an organism was free to state uncompromisingly a truth which the individual members, bound as they were to an actual system, could not state effectively. Thus it is with all official pronouncements concerning social evils. The pronouncements have significance, even if the church is not in a position to do much toward itself putting them into practice.

The second sphere in which the church can render high social service is in giving the prophet his chance. It is obvious that the majority of the ministers of any denomination never can be prophets. They are

not built for the prophetic career. They do vast good in catching the thought and spirit of their congregations at rather a lofty level, and in so phrasing that thought that by the very phrasing it ministers to people; but they are not made for prophecy. They cannot endure the shocks which the prophetic message provokes. They would better not attempt prophecy, for too much of somebody's time is lost in soothing and coddling their hurt souls after the first combat with the forces of this world. Nevertheless it is imperative that we have prophets, and those who themselves cannot prophesy ought to exert themselves to the utmost to make a place for the prophet—to stand by and give him his chance, even when his prophecies seem needlessly severe and frightfully ill balanced. It was the glory of ancient Israel, not merely that mighty prophets arose in her history, but that the moral and spiritual temper of the nation was such as to give them their chance after they appeared, and to make the most of the messages which they uttered. I once knew a smug and complacent ecclesiastic who advised a group of ministers to let a certain religious prophet fight his own battle. The exhortation concluded with the remark that even martyrdom itself would add to the effectiveness of the prophetic words. Probably not many people would be complacent as was this acquaintance of mine, but many seem to feel that martyrdom is good publicity. Of course it is true that stupid defenders of an established order do

hurt their own cause when they hound prophets to martyrdom, but nevertheless the crucifixion of prophets is a wasteful procedure. Prophets arise too seldom for us to shorten their careers. At whatever cost to ourselves in discomfort and irritation, we should insist upon allowing the prophet to say what the spirit drives him to say. Let us remember that only the most terrific exertions will make any change in human institutions. The men who keep screaming out in alarm lest somebody overturn the present capitalistic or industrial order seem not to know that the order is in possession of about all the defense mechanisms there are. Never since time began have established orders so buttressed themselves as they have done and are doing at the present hour. Only the furious speech of the prophet can start anything at all. Only the proposal radically to tear down and rebuild some social institutions can stir most of us out of our inertness. Then let the prophet make his proposals! He helps the church save her own soul.

It remains to be said that any religious denomination to-day has some definite and specific relations to the industrial world which must not be forgotten in considering the general aspects which I have thus far mentioned. The church, for illustration, is a vast employing agency. I do not now refer to ministers and teachers and other such consecrated and self-sacrificial workers. I refer rather to the wage-earners in the material enterprises of the church. To speak

more concretely, every considerable denomination has large publishing interests, and the publishing houses are the chief field in which the professions of interest in labor on the part of the church can be tested out. What delicious bits of wisdom I have heard in my day as justifying rather second-rate labor policies in denominational publishing houses! I have heard that the workers in such houses ought to be content with fewer privileges than those in other houses, because the profits of such church publishing are being used for a holy purpose! I have heard, too, that the dissemination of religious literature is itself so sacred that printers' unions ought to estimate the blessed privilege of such dissemination as part of their compensation! This was especially delightful coming to me—years ago indeed—from a house that was in the general manufacturing trade, and had for part of its religious task the publication of telephone directories.

The compelling force in bringing about any actual advance in society is public opinion itself. All that I have said has proceeded on the assumption that the agencies and methods I am mentioning achieve their direct result through public opinion. If we consider that twenty-two millions of church communicants are represented in one way or another in the Federal Council of Churches of America, and that sixteen millions of Roman Catholics have the National Welfare Council of the Catholic Church as their voice on social matters, and that other millions speak through

a like agency among the Jews, we can see that we are dealing with a cross-section of American democracy in the constituency of these worthy bodies. Here is an audience comprising almost half the population of the United States directly open to the social message of the churches. Can there be any slightest doubt as to the duty of the churches in the presence of such an opportunity? Ought we to hesitate to advocate whatever social changes or reorganizations seem called for by the spirit of the prophets and of the Christ? The direct appeal to this mass of believers can be made effective as against all varieties of formal ecclesiastical resistance. Officials are necessary, but ecclesiastical officialism has made a sorry show again and again in the history of the church. Ecclesiastical privilege is just as deadly in its viper-like fury against loss of power as is any form of privilege, but the all-pervasive sentiment of so many millions of believers comes at times to be irresistible. With such widespread opinion righteously aroused, a social climate can be created in which evil inevitably wilts and dies and the larger good gets its chance. When I was a boy I used to wonder who killed the monstrous animals that splashed about in prehistoric swamps. As I grew older I found food for reflection in the fact that nobody killed them. The climate changed, and they died.

THE CHANGING PLACE OF THE CHURCH

EDWARD T. DEVINE

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL ECONOMY, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of New York for twenty-one years, editor of *The Survey,* founder of the New York School of Social Work, in charge of the American Red Cross work after the San Francisco fire, member of the United States Coal Commission, special agent for the United States Government in Russia—few men have crowded so many varied forms of social adventuring into the brief span of a single life.

Born on an Iowa farm in 1867, Dr. Devine received his education at Cornell College, which was followed by graduate study at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Halle. Beginning in 1896 as a pioneer in many aspects of social work, he soon became a recognized leader in this field. He carries on a wide lecture program on social, educational, and economic topics. Since September, 1919, he has had engagements in 362 towns and cities of forty-seven States.

Among Dr. Devine's books are the following: *Coal,* 1925; *Social Work,* 1922; *Disabled Soldiers and Sailors,* 1919; *The Normal Life,* 1917; *The Family and Social Work,* 1912; *Misery and Its Causes,* 1909; *The Principles of Relief,* 1904; *The Practice of Charity,* 1901; *Economics,* 1898. He has written hundreds of magazine articles, pamphlets, conference addresses, and other occasional papers.

THE CHANGING PLACE OF THE CHURCH

EDWARD T. DEVINE

The modern church in American communities has a position unlike that of its predecessors in earlier centuries; its program must correspond to the facts of the world in which it functions. The church itself performs only a fraction of the functions which formerly devolved upon it. Education, organized provision for the sick and the aged, and economic activities have slipped into other hands. Nevertheless the church is not the poorer but is positively the gainer by these differentiations. The church does not cease to interest itself in the activities which were once performed within its buildings and under its authority. From the point of view of the church the community abounds in flourishing, well-supported, and usually well-directed educational, medical, and social agencies, every one of which is as amenable to any good influence, any spiritual inspiration which can come from the church as if they were still a part of the church's own organized activities.

The church is not an unsuccessful competitor for the loyalty of her members with outside competing

agencies. To think of the relation in this way is wholly to misunderstand it. The church sees, in the educational, recreational, remedial, preventive agencies of the community, the means of applying her own lessons, the means of affording a large scope to the beneficence which she inculcates. The church inspires and teaches good-will, coöperative effort, righteous conduct. The Legal Aid Society, the Child Placing Society, the Family Welfare Society, give to church members, who have heard these teachings, an opportunity to put them into practice. The social agencies are mainly undenominational and so promote Christian unity. They tend to accept common principles founded upon observation, comparison, and experience, and so bring to the church the criterion for testing their accepted traditions and ideas. The church educates its youth and preaches regeneration to the transgressor. The social agencies take the educated youth and the repentant pagan and give them an opportunity to show the sincerity and depth of their training or conversion.

The church which is wise in its generation does not consider that only the things which are done in the church buildings or under its own immediate auspices are evidences of Christian character. The church which is alive to its modern opportunities calls upon its members continuously for a report of their stewardship, and by this they will mean not only what the church has told them to do in securing new members or strengthening their weaker brethren

within the fold, but also what they have done as citizens, as neighbors, as socially minded community workers. The live church is the one which inspires the largest amount of such community activities, wholly indifferent whether actual work is done in an organization which calls itself by the name of the church or in one which is unsectarian or secular.

The special function of the church is personal regeneration and spiritual development, but the field of the church is as broad as the world. Wherever in any helpful human contact the evidence can be given that the Christian has found and is walking in the way of light, there the fruits of regeneration and development are found. If this is a sound view of the relation between the church and the social agencies, it is evident that church members who wish to learn how to discharge their obligations as such must know their communities in the same sense in which social workers are expected to know them. They must know about the kind and amount of poverty; the kind and amount of preventable sickness; what provision is needed for those who are in fact ill and who do not have the means to provide for the expense of their illness; what conditions there are which are leading to juvenile crime and depravity; what are the conditions in jails, prisons, reformatories, and police stations; what conditions there may be of overcrowding, undernourishment, overwork, or other social maladjustments. These things they must know, and with them

they must be prepared to deal, not—or at least not only—as experts in the several fields of social effort but merely as Christians.

The ethics of business and of economic relations are as important to the modern church as they were to the Stoic philosophers or the medieval schoolmen. Social agencies of various kinds are at hand to aid the modern Christian in obtaining the knowledge and understanding upon which any system of practical ethics must be based. Expert specialized bureaus in the federal, state, and municipal governments; foundations which have been created to study and improve working and living conditions; voluntary associations like the Consumers League, the Child Labor Committee, and the Association of Labor Legislation are constantly engaged in adding to the sum of human knowledge in regard to adverse conditions which must be corrected. It is the clear duty of the church to share in this knowledge as soon as it becomes available, and to impart to church members in appropriate ways such analysis of it as will facilitate the discharge of their Christian obligations. The social agencies publish a large amount of valuable information, often digesting and simplifying it so that the most preoccupied and overburdened ministers may obtain what is necessary to start a train of thought which may culminate in a sermon, in an address at a mid-weekly meeting, or in private conversation with parishioners. The church has no obligation to accept such material

without scrutinizing it; but it is the fact that the organized foundations, government bureaus, and social agencies have been extraordinarily conscientious and have ordinarily had the benefit of scientifically trained advisers in preparing such material as is offered to the church. There may be no obligation to preach a special sermon on one of the days selected by the agencies for the purpose. Ministers complain that if they responded to all such requests there would be no days left to preach the gospel. Nevertheless it would seem that there may be a prima facie obligation to consider whether a moral, ethical, and even religious issue is not involved whenever such a request is made, and whether the church must not face squarely the obligation to deal with such issues, if not in the way suggested, then in some other manner appropriate to its own procedure.

The new situation presented to the churches of the development of the social agencies may profitably be considered from another point of view. In the practice of making a budget for community chests, and in the general coöperative movement in social work of which the joint financial campaign is only one feature, there has come to be recognized a rough and ready distinction between the relief agencies of charitable institutions on the one hand and the so-called character-building agencies on the other hand, those which provide social, educational, recreational influences. A hospital, a day nursery,

a Family Welfare Society would fall in the former group; a community center, a social settlement, a Y.M.C.A., a boys' club, camp-fire, and scouting in the latter. Vehement objections are naturally made to any exclusive appropriation of the term "character building" by the second group, since the relief and health agencies conceive their task also as including a successful dealing with problems of character. The correction of bad habits, the development of new and better attitudes, the encouragement of self-respect, self-help, are in every program of good social case work.

Now comes the church with a more sweeping and fundamental challenge. What is the church for if not for the building of character? Why should social work, however necessary it is for the relief of distress, for the solution of financial, economic, hygienic, or sociological problems, claim for itself in any of its branches the prime responsibility for character building in the youth of the community.

The answer is that social work always is the indictment of one or more of the normal and permanent social institutions, such as the family, the school, the courts, the factory, the church, and the State. In this instance the churches, by which we mean here, of course, the organized bodies of human beings, with their finite wisdom, their fallible leadership, their limited resources, their imperfect vision, have left large gaps which the character-building agencies are trying to fill. If, in stepping into these

unoccupied places, the agencies advertise the remissness of the churches, the latter have only themselves and their pastors to blame.

Wherein then does the failure lie? First of all in not keeping abreast of modern experimental science. For a generation now the biologists and psychologists have been contributing positive knowledge, illuminating generalizations, practically helpful principles, to the solution of character problems.

It is no longer permissible to assume that God-fearing, well-meaning parents, and volunteer Sunday-school teachers will necessarily know what influences are actually at work on the minds of children or how to counteract such as are evil. Mere knowledge and native impulses are alike in these modern days at a discount. Habits are taken more seriously. We are not slaves of habits; for habits can be changed. To change them, however, we need to know the rules by which they are changed. There is not as much guesswork about this as formerly. Some conclusions rest on patient, long continued, abundantly corroborated observation. Desirable habits can be cultivated. Injurious habits can be replaced. The individual child can be studied so as to discover to what appeals he will respond, what motives are latent, what kinks there are in his mind which are to be straightened out only by subtle, indirect means. The relation between nourishment, sleep, fatigue, nervous strain or irritation, and moral conduct is no longer to be ignored or dealt with only in general

terms. If the church accepts the responsibility for building character, and challenges the qualifications of the social agencies to carry it, then the church must learn from the psychologists and psychiatrists, as well as from the economists and biologists.

The behavior of individuals under temptation, in an exalted condition, in bereavement, in moments of great spiritual insight, in periods of quiet reliance on an overruling Providence, is of supreme importance for the church; and ability to predict what that behavior will be, even to induce a right choice when a tremendous pull is taking place to persuade a wrong choice, is apparently one way to express the supreme duty of the church.

If the church will freely accept this responsibility, will go out of its way to make clear to the social agencies that it covets the task, the relation between the church and the agencies will be greatly clarified. They can improve social conditions. They can do social case work. They can provide maintenance. They can discover the sources of strength and weakness in their clients. What they need and know that they need in the vast majority of the situations that they confront, is to find some power to induce rational and beneficent behavior, some means of conversion—to use an accurate and familiar term. The church has this spiritual power, this secret of the conversion of human desire. It is and knows itself to be the custodian of a message, the teacher of a way of life. To connect this mission with the specific

opportunities revealed in its daily routine of the social agencies, it is necessary only that both church and social agencies should see each other face to face.

HOW CHRISTIANS MIGHT COÖPERATE

JOHN A. LAPP

Director, Department of Social Action
National Catholic Welfare Conference

For many years Mr. Lapp has been associated with efforts for social betterment as a public official, investigator, and writer. After graduate work in the University of Wisconsin and Cornell University, he became, in 1913, director of the Legislative Reference Bureau for Indiana. This was at the beginning of the development of special libraries, and his service to Indiana was a notable achievement. He was influential for many years in the Special Libraries Association, and organized the Public Affairs Information Service.

In 1914 President Wilson appointed Mr. Lapp on the commission to investigate vocational education, and as a result he drafted the present national vocational education law. In 1918 he entered another field of public service as the director of the Ohio Commission on Social Insurance. Among many other activities has been his participation in the organization of national associations for librarians and social workers, and this year the presidency of the National Conference of Social Work.

Among his publications are: *Learning to Earn, Our America, Economics and the Community, The American Citizen, Practical Social Science,* and *Hospital Law.* For three years he was editor of the *Nation's Health.*

Since 1918, when his connection with the National Catholic Welfare Conference began, Mr. Lapp has conducted social surveys of many of the larger dioceses of this country. At present he travels and lectures widely. Probably no one could be found who has formed a closer association between the ideals of the Catholic Church and the practical efforts of social work.

HOW CHRISTIANS MIGHT COÖPERATE

JOHN A. LAPP

Social work is a vast enterprise—far beyond the general knowledge. The total expenditure in any normal year in the United States approaches if it does not exceed three billions of dollars. This vast sum is provided by the government, national, state, and local; by philanthropic organizations raising their money through community chests or otherwise; and by churches, fraternal organizations, and benefit societies which provide mutual aid or charity. Obviously in a work so extensive the means of coöperation among the agencies which perform it should be effective. No one agency should attempt to do things without knowing the extent and the resources of other existing activities.

Roughly speaking, the federal government takes care of the wreckage of war and at present is spending, for the care of the disabled and for pensions, more than three quarters of a billion dollars. The state government provides especially for mental defectives and to some degree for dependents and in a single year expends more than one third of

a billion dollars in social work. The counties and the cities provide in the main for material relief and for the maintenance of the indigent in institutions. The figures on this have not been compiled but approach two thirds of a billion dollars annually. The non-sectarian social agencies spend as much as a hundred million dollars in their respective activities for welfare. Churches and fraternal orders maintain a variety of charities, including hospitals, and spend an untold sum of money, certainly amounting to more than two hundred million dollars every year. Governments, local, State, and national, have also the enormous expense of caring for moral breakdown in the form of crime. These figures will emphasize the importance of determining the proper place of each of the major agencies which engage in promoting human welfare and in protecting the wreckage of society.

What the place of the church is in the vast program of welfare may be seen better when the prime purpose of social work is viewed. That purpose is the protection or restoration of the integrity of human beings. Social work recognizes that man is a spiritual being; that he is not a machine; that he does not exist merely "to add a laborer to the state"; that he has essential rights not only for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," but is entitled to protection against the forces which destroy his integrity. Looked at in this way we see that man must be protected in his physical integrity, his eco-

nomic, civic, and moral integrity. Anything that interferes with these essential integrities of man should be prevented, mitigated, or destroyed.

Man must be protected physically against breakdown and its consequences. Long hours of labor, dangerous machinery, unhealthful conditions of life or labor, must be prevented in the interest of man's physical integrity. The economic rights of man must be respected. Man is entitled to the chance to live and must be secured in that right, which carries with it employment and a living wage. Without these his economic integrity cannot exist. Man is entitled to civic rights and must possess them unhampered if he is to promote his interest and protect his welfare. The moral and spiritual integrity of man must be safeguarded to prevent that form of breakdown which results in crime, degradation, and destitution.

Here is outlined briefly the purpose of social work as it relates to human beings. The program to carry it out consists of three parts. First, the prevention of the causes that interfere with or destroy any one of the essential parts of the integrity of man. Second, rehabilitation, which attempts to restore man to independent capacities, physical, vocational, and moral. Lastly, the program of care which provides for those in whom disaster has not been prevented and who cannot be rehabilitated into independence.

When we analyze the disasters of human life we clarify our minds greatly with respect to the huge problem of poverty. When we know why people are

poor we can determine the means necessary for prevention and rehabilitation, and we can understand better our obligations for the care of the poor. When we make such inquiries we find that the causes center in the breaking of human resistance and the sapping of the integrity of human beings. We find the physical integrity of men undermined by the ravages of war and disease, by excessive labor, by drugs, intoxicants, and other destroyers, and by the lack of medical and hospital care. We find men destroyed in their economic life by failure to secure work, by the lack of a living wage, by the loss of property in business failures, by the lack of vocational training, and by the failure to promote social insurance against the calamities which are bound to come. We find men without civic intelligence or interest failing to use their ballots for their own and the common good. We find men sinking into degradation by contact with the forces of evil and by the lack of education and character training.

Looking at all these sources of evil to men, we must be impressed with the fact that the great bulk of the causes which drive people into poverty are causes over which they individually have no control. There can be no doubt that the great bulk, fully ninety per cent., of the twelve million people who during the past year have been in poverty or on its fringes, are there from such causes.

We have, then, a definite requirement upon us to provide in justice against the disasters which human

beings by themselves cannot help. We must therefore think in terms of justice first and charity afterward; of the creation of a system approaching ever toward a just social order in which men will be protected against the calamities for which they are blameless. Charity comes in to provide for those whom justice has not protected and for those who have wilfully failed. Charity is called upon to relieve the suffering, to help the fallen, and to revive the despairing.

What is the place of the church in the program of social work? The church stands for justice and charity: for justice to prevent the breakdown of human physique and character and to provide for the material wants of the fallen, and for charity to fill in the gaps where justice has failed. The part of the church is plain. It should stand for social action to prevent injustice and destroy its sources. It should coöperate with all movements that prevent physical, economic, civic, and moral weakness. It cares for man in all his essential integrity, and it cannot be indifferent to the environing institutions which control their lives and endanger them. The church should be a factor in programs of prevention and rehabilitation. Especially should it be a factor in all those agencies which stabilize human character and prevent decay. The church should be a factor in restoring the morals and the morale of men in order to fit them again for life. The church should be a factor in the care of all those who are

in poverty, ever keeping a watchful eye wherein the ministrations of charity and religion might help to restore, to independence, human beings weakened in body, mind, or morals.

Chief among the direct means of buttressing the individual is the protection and promotion of family life. To this end the church can make the foremost contribution. One of the great foundation blocks in the structure of religious charities is the family. The church believes in the family, and its charities are directed toward the strengthening of family life. The family is merely the extension of the individual. It precedes other forms of social organization and has rights and duties which ought not to be interfered with. The church works for all measures that strengthen the family, and against all that would harm it. Many attitudes of church leaders toward social questions of the day can be readily understood if the simple fact of the recognition of the family as a divine institution is kept in view. It should not be assumed, however, that the family is beyond social control. It is not immune from interference when either the rights of individuals composing it or the social good is involved, but it must be said that the burden of proof that individual or social good is involved rests upon those who make the claim.

The church has throughout the ages been a factor in the care of the poor. At one time the church was practically the only agency of relief. That was when economic life was more stable and so large a pro-

portion did not descend into absolute want. The church still plays a great part in this aspect of social work. Hospital enterprises of great extent conducted by many religious denominations, homes for the aged, institutions for the care of children, agencies for the care of wayward boys and girls, as well as provision for material relief, attest the part which the church now plays as good Samaritan in the care of the poor.

The question is rightly asked: What is the proper division of work between the church agencies and the non-sectarian and governmental agencies? They all seem to be doing the same work. Is it not likely that there is overlapping of functions and waste of effort? Undoubtedly there is duplication. But no universal rule can be laid down. The functions of the different charities vary in different communities according to circumstances. In some States and cities there is adequate provision for the material relief of poverty, the care of the insane, and the care of the sick. Under such circumstances private charities or those of the church do not need to supply material facilities. In other communities these services are poorly developed or entirely wanting. In some communities there is ample provision for recreation and for character-building work for boys and girls. In others these are non-existent. In some communities the care of dependent children is provided for or at least supported by the city, county, or State. In others this whole burden is placed upon

private and church charities. So the extent of co-operation on the part of the church cannot be definitely stated, nor can a uniform rule be laid down. There are some things that may be stated as axiomatic. The burden is so enormous that nothing short of the power of public taxation can provide the means to carry all of it. The church and all the combined social agencies, with all the money-getting abilities of community chest organizers, could supply but a fraction of the great sums that are needed to care for the wreckage of war, physical disability, unemployment, mental defectiveness, old age dependency, and other results of poverty.

There is one contribution of the church to modern social work that ought to stand out preëminently as its greatest help to all welfare agencies. It is this, that charity is a personal duty involving participation by all of the people and not merely by some. The scriptural injunction to do good works has given us a host of individual workers in the cause of charity. Many thousands of men and women in societies, organizations, and religious orders give up some or all of their time to the extending of relief, of sympathy, and of good cheer. In stable communities where families live on from generation to generation, where neighbors are known, and where the chaos of modern industrial society has not penetrated, the individual volunteer workers through the church or parish societies or lay organizations are able to perform the bulk of the work of charity

and do it well. In such communities the ideal of personal service inculcated by the church works out quite perfectly. It is recognized, however, that in the modern city with its shifting population and its unstable society something more is needed, and so we have the organization of the united charities, diocesan bureaus, and other organized forms of relief. The extent to which these organizations secure active participation of volunteers in personal works for the poor is a measure of their success. The church stimulates the "heroism of charity" on the part of its members and brings them to the support of organized relief. It should be the aim of the church and of organized charities to find ways in which the volunteer may be used effectively. The success of the charities of the church, in ages past, was due largely to its ability to unify its organized activities and its lay organizations in one great movement for the temporal and spiritual welfare of man.

The church has two functions in all respects that it can and will perform. It will provide for the poor and the needy when the institutions of justice fail and when community means are not available for the poor on a basis which respects their character as human beings. Secondly, it fits into the program of public and private charities at all points. It is essentially a promoter of justice and thereby a preventer of human decay. The church is essentially an instrumentality for the buttressing of human

beings against moral deterioration. It is also a power in building new moral foundations under the broken parts of humanity, making it possible for the lowly to rise out of their physical or moral weakness. The church inspires men to a better life. It looks upon man as being made in the image of his Creator and cares for him because of the purpose for which it believes he was created. In all forms of care, whether it be of the sick and the disabled, the economically destitute, the morally degraded, the church supplements what other agencies of material relief may do. The church cannot under existing circumstances aspire to be the sole agency of charity. All the combined powers of all the churches in America could not meet urgent material needs, but the church can make more universal the spirit of charity and can spiritualize all of the activities under whomsoever carried on which tend toward the protection of the integrity of man.

COÖPERATING WITH CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS

HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM

Editor, "The American City"

Mr. Buttenheim's interests have long been identified with the municipal and civic field, in which his motive power has always been a practical idealism. During many years of successful effort in the organization and editing of technical and civic journals, he has established coöperative relationships with community leaders in many cities. Mr. Buttenheim has a genius for friendship and for organization—a combination that has allied him with the activities of a wide range of national and international bodies and has insured to him the deep esteem and loyalty of his fellow-workers.

In 1913, after he and his brother had established *The American City* magazine on a self-sustaining basis, the two brothers formed a second organization, the American City Bureau. It has promoted the efficiency of civic and social welfare organizations in hundreds of cities by helping them to function financially and assisting them in maintaining a high standard of civic consciousness.

In his double capacity of president of the bureau and editor of the magazine, Mr. Buttenheim has been active in spreading the modern conception of city planning and community organization, including not only the physical phases, but the governmental, educational, social, and spiritual elements as well. His connection with various associations has familiarized him with the difficulties that beset the paths of civic workers; this led him to organize recently the Snag Club, in whose meetings searchlights are directed upon various obstacles to progress and serve to disclose ways of avoiding or removing these troublesome "snags."

In the following chapter Mr. Buttenheim presents his convictions as to the opportunity of the church in reaching out to touch more closely the lives of the people in the problems of community development, and as to how some of the difficulties in the way of unity of effort between religious and civic bodies can be removed by effective coöperation.

COÖPERATING WITH CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS

HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM

If good-will were always joined with clear vision, if clear vision could always discover the right path to an ideal goal, if human beings generally were endowed not only with such will and vision, but also with abundant energy and skill, then there would be no occasion for writing this chapter. In such a world, coöperation in solving community problems would be an easy task for the church—if, indeed, any unsolved community problems could be discovered.

But not all ministers or church workers, when visualizing the city of God on earth, visualize the same kind of city; and even where there is agreement as to the goal, theories as to how to attain it vary widely. As a result, the doctrine of separation of church and state has been carried so far in most American cities as to leave for the church little more than an indirect "inspirational" influence on good government and civic progress.

When Professor Davis asked me to write this chapter, he suggested that church coöperation with chambers of commerce and other community organizations be especially stressed, that some definite examples be cited, and that suggestions be offered as to just how far the pastors and the churches might wisely go in attempting to influence the civic life of their communities. Although having had rather exceptional opportunities in recent years to observe such coöperation, I realized that little of it had come to my attention; but I hoped, with the aid of some of the socially minded chamber of commerce secretaries, to find at least a few definite examples worth quoting. So letters were written to a score or more of them, in cities large and small, and in widely scattered parts of the United States. Some of these men have been engaged in civic work, not only in the cities they are now serving, but as organizers or consultants in many other communities.

These excerpts from characteristic replies indicate widely different experiences and points of view:

While in every city I have served, members of the clergy of all denominations have been included in our membership—and I have found them always willing to coöperate—church organizations as such have never allied themselves in any civic uplift or reform work.

In my twelve years of experience I have made a number of efforts to line up the churches in community matters, and beyond the point of a meeting, or something of that kind, nothing has ever been done. Last year one of our churches

had a community night, at which the mayor, the superintendent of schools, and a judge spoke. I presided at the meeting, representing the Chamber of Commerce. I have addressed men's clubs in the churches. Frankly, I don't think that such things are of any value, other than publicity for the Chamber of Commerce. There are so many factors keeping the churches apart that there is little they can agree upon.

I presume the reason that we have not had coöperation from the churches is that we have not sought it. The large percentage of our directors are active in church affairs, and through them we have obtained moral support of church members without actively seeking it, but largely because the men who were heading our committees dealing with community projects are well known and well regarded. I feel the initiative for such coöperation could come better from the Chamber of Commerce than it could from the church; however, if an organization like the ministerial association should request our coöperation, we would give the request serious consideration and no doubt would agree to aid in the undertaking for which they ask support.

The principal contribution that a church makes to the solving of community problems is the splendid educational work it can and often does do.

As a group, in an average score of towns, I have found the ministerial association to be more selfish, more quibbling, more short-sighted, and more egotistical than any other combination of citizens. With over thirteen years of varied experience in public enterprises, I cannot point to one specific instance where the church has been anything but an insignificant contributing factor in civic activities.

There is hardly a community effort of any kind, be it social welfare, or politics, or otherwise, but what the church

plays a very definite part therein. In all of our community-wide movements we call upon our various churches to co-operate with us. This applies to our own membership campaigns as well as to fire prevention and other civic endeavors.

It is my observation that many ministers are indifferent to chambers of commerce and the work they endeavor to do for the community. I personally feel that they are neglecting one of the finest opportunities to influence men. Some ministers, however, have even assisted in work for playgrounds, and in putting through a zoning ordinance. Such activities increase their influence with business men, and I believe that they should coöperate more in community work.

My memory does not seem to serve me in producing instances of the church as an active factor in the general community program. In fact, I had occasion to say once at a preachers' meeting that the church is the one group of individuals in a community who are supposed to be vitally interested in human welfare upon which, as a group, I have never been able to depend for active civic service. Of course the individuals are prominent—perhaps among the most prominent—in civic and social work, and of course hundreds of ministers are doing yeoman service. The church as an institution, however, seems to have failed in participation in general community programs; but perhaps my experience has been particularly unfortunate.

Several of the letters mention the willingness of the churches to coöperate, through the pulpit and otherwise, in Civic Sunday or Civic Week programs. Such events are often important factors in the success of a community chest drive or in a campaign

for more adequate support, moral and financial, by the community, in the civic work of the chamber of commerce.

A former clergyman, now engaged professionally as an "educational director" in civic and social welfare campaigns, writes an exceptionally critical and helpful letter:

I know of no instance where any church has given active support to any social service or civic-commercial undertaking in its city. Playgrounds, sanitation, parks, improved living conditions, the Chamber of Commerce and the Community Chest—are alien names and thoughts to the average church. They speak in terms of home and foreign missions; of the financial programs of their denominations, and the minister's salary.

There comes to my mind the case of a resort city in a Northern State. In the course of a year, thousands of girls came to this place. The Y.W.C.A. had done a noble piece of work there. It had saved the honor—and in one case the life—of many young girls. However, the ministerial union refused to indorse and support the movement, claiming that the "Y" was in competition with the churches. In a burst of confidence, one of the clergymen told me, afterwards, that he wanted to buy a new pipe organ for his church, and that the "Y" fund would defeat his purpose.

The attitude of the average clergyman and the average ministerial association in the cities where I have worked with councils of social agencies is either indifferent or openly hostile to the community chest idea. Their contention is that the chest is doing the work of the churches, but when they are quizzed they will admit that the churches are not doing this job, and that they have neither the training, the manpower, nor the money to do it.

When I asked a certain ministerial group to indorse the enterprise of their Chamber of Commerce, I was answered that the work of the churches was paramount and that a true minister could not come out of the roseate spiritual mists to "serve tables." This was in the face of the fact that of the twenty major articles in the organization's program of work, fourteen were strictly in the field of human service.

But here is the bright side of the picture: A substantial majority of the leaders in chamber of commerce, community chest, and other civic and social service ventures of the country are, in the field of my observation, active church men. In this group are a large number of clergymen. In nearly every city where I have worked, I have found at least one minister who was a community man. Every now and then I am able to include in this number a Catholic priest. Their churches, as churches, do not follow them, but the public does, and it usually fills their churches.

I am wondering if, after all, the church hasn't carried out some of the spirit of its mission when it sets a light which illuminates the souls of even a few of its people with the vision of practical workaday service. On the other hand, if ministers and their churches would throw themselves actively into, say, the enterprises of the chamber of commerce and of the local community chest, certain very interesting results might follow. I am very sure that the average chamber of commerce would be shaped up more nearly to spiritualized ideals. I do not mean to say that the chamber of commerce would, or should, become a religious institution, but it would become, more truly, a *community* movement. It would, of necessity, give more attention to a lot of matters which are quite as paramount as the location of a new industry, or the extension of a new sewer on Main Street. It would give more thought to homes, playgrounds, parks, beauty, law enforcement, and the welfare, health, and happiness of people as set over against things.

In the community chest field, the results would, I think, be almost revolutionary. I believe it would eliminate deficits in all conscientiously prepared budgets, and simplify and clarify the work of social service agencies.

The effect on the churches themselves, in either case, would be helpful. It would have a tendency to minimize their unimportant differences, and stress their uncommon importance in bringing to pass the common good.

But further quotation must be omitted, that there may be space for some categorical suggestions, the more general application of which, it is believed, would benefit both the churches and their communities; for, as has been suggested by an eminent sociologist, if we can do everywhere what is now being done with success somewhere, the world will be remade.

1. *The Moral Obligation to Be Intelligent.*— The minister should remember constantly his obligation to serve the Lord not only with his heart and soul and strength, but also with his *mind.* His daily devotions might well include one of the greatest short prayers ever uttered: "Oh, grant me understanding, and I shall live." His strictly religious reading should be supplemented by the information and inspiration he will gain from such magazines as *The Survey,* or *Social Forces,* and by reading as many of the worth-while books and pamphlets on civic and social welfare problems as his purse can afford or his public library can furnish. The *Information Service,* published weekly by the Research

Department of the Commission on the Church and Social Service, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York, will be found especially helpful.

2. *Contacts with Business Men and Civic Organizations.*—Through such reading the minister will know something of modern ideas on city planning and zoning, housing betterment, fire protection, parks and playgrounds, methods of promoting public health and safety, and other devices for making cities more livable. Thus equipped with civic theory, the pastor who really means business will take frequent opportunity to discuss community problems with representative members of his congregation and with leaders in various municipal and civic activities. He will identify himself, as a member at least, with the chamber of commerce and other leading civic and welfare bodies in his community. Opportunity will doubtless come to him to serve on the directorate or committees of these organizations, or on boards appointed by the mayor. He will strengthen his influence as a community leader by so doing—assuming, of course, that he takes such assignments seriously, and gives intelligent, dependable service.

3. *Avoidance of Partizan Politics.*—The minister will now be better able to point out in his sermons the relationship of civics to religion, and the superior claims of justice to charity in human affairs. He will not, however, be content with mere denunciation of evil conditions or with enunciation

of glittering generalities of duty to the community, but will inspire the members of his church to definite action. Right here, however, he faces a delicate problem. His church membership includes men and women of different political faiths and of a very wide range of liberal and conservative attitudes. The line between partizan politics and fundamental questions of right and wrong is often a difficult one to draw. Occasion may arise when a civic question involving a great moral issue will require that the pulpit take a side in a political campaign; but, as a rule, the influence of the church will be much more effective if it advocates principles rather than candidates.

4. *Challenging the Imagination of the Layman.* To inspire his parishioners to definite civic work is perhaps the most important coöperation which a pastor can render toward the solution of community problems. The preaching of civic righteousness in the abstract may occasionally fall on receptive soil; but if the pastor will put some of his ideas into concrete form, his parishioners will be much more likely to build them into real community undertakings. In more than one small town, where no active civic organization was functioning, a wide-awake clergyman has been the actual organizer of such a group through which he and his parishioners could become more vocal civically than through the church as such. One reason, I believe, that many churches have lost their ablest members as active

workers is the failure of the pastors to suggest activities more challenging to the imagination than passing the collection plate or making candy for the church fair.

5. *Discovering and Inspiring Future Community Leaders.*—Through the Sunday-schools, also, much can be done to show the definite application of Christian ethics and ideals to civic welfare. To discover and inspire future community leaders is one of the most important tasks in the world. Why should not every pastor appoint a small committee of outstanding men and women whose task it would be to search out from among the young people of the parish those best equipped mentally and socially to serve their community, and through personal conferences to help direct their energies into active civic work?

6. *The Open Forum, Seeking Truth.*—In many cities and especially in towns and villages, the churches might take the leadership in establishing or popularizing an open forum movement. Highly controversial subjects, when discussed, should be presented from more than one point of view; but instead of a debate wherein each side is more concerned with victory than with truth, the opposing sides should be urged to seek agreement on fundamental principles. If the ideal goal can be discovered, the path to it will be much more likely to be found also.

7. *Suggesting Ideas for Public Discussion.*—An excellent device to stimulate constructive thought by

community leaders is to invite the city government, the chamber of commerce, women's clubs, and other civic bodies to furnish speakers on municipal and civic problems for open forum meetings or for men's clubs or other groups within the church. By suggesting an idea for discussion in this way, the minister may "start something" which will have a far-reaching effect. Most chambers of commerce might well give more thought to the civic and moral implications of what they may regard as matters of strictly business concern; and the ministers, on their part, do not always consider sufficiently the economic implications of idealistic projects. An appreciation of the other fellow's point of view may help both groups to discover the common ground along which they could march with united front.

8. *Application of the Project Method.*—Attempts have often been made to bring about the representation of all the civic and social welfare organizations of a city in a community council or similar clearing-house, which is supposed to result in unity of action on important civic projects. But such experiments have seldom justified the hopes of their organizers—one reason being that even the "best people" can't always agree as to the wisdom of specific undertakings. As an alternative to this, what has been called the "project" method may recommend itself to many pastors. By studying intelligently the civic life of his town and conferring frequently with other community leaders, a wide-awake

pastor will be impressed from time to time with some definite need to be met; and he may even have a practical program for meeting that need. Why should not he undertake to "sell" the idea, in personal conferences, to the particular men and women in his church, or outside of it, who would be most likely to sympathize with that particular project and to take the leadership in bringing about its accomplishment? For the next civic project quite a different group of leaders may be chosen; but the minister, working quietly behind the scenes, may, through his ideas and influence, become in reality his city's most effective civic worker.

9. *Enlisting the Churches in United Action.*— Occasionally a moral issue will arise of such outstanding importance as to demand the united action of all the churches and civic groups in the community. In such a case *every* church in the city will strengthen itself if *all* churches can be united, through a local federation of churches or ministerial association, in behalf of the project. And where one church, going it alone, might fail to get the backing of the civic organizations, the united churches could hardly fail to line up the chamber of commerce, women's clubs, and other influential secular groups. Through a united front the church leaders can impress an entire city with the fact that they not only function during the comparatively few hours when the church buildings are open, but are actively concerned with community conditions which affect the

moral and spiritual life of the people every hour of every day.

10. *Parish and Community Houses.*—The limits of this chapter preclude a discussion of the excellent seven-day service which many churches are rendering to their members or to their neighborhoods, through the medium of parish or community houses.

A separate building for this purpose, or parish-house equipment in a portion of the church building itself, is essential, of course, for maximum efficiency in church work. Properly organized by natural age groups, for worship, religious education, friendship, recreation, and social welfare activities, any large church can perform a seven-day service. But a community house planned primarily as a social and civic center for an entire town or neighborhood, involves bigger problems of administration and finance. Decision by any church to undertake such an enterprise should be based on a careful survey of existing facilities and services and a desire to avoid duplication. If a real need is found to exist, and if the community house when built is thrown open to such agencies as women's clubs, civic improvement associations, boy and girl scouts, labor-unions, lecture courses, farmers' meetings, and the like, the community will be saved the cost of extra buildings.

Much valuable printed matter is available on the planning and operation of such buildings. The project ought not to be undertaken, however, without counting well the cost of upkeep, both in money

and man-power—and woman-power. Consideration might well be given, also, before launching such an undertaking, to whether the job in that particular case may not properly be one for the municipality to undertake, as part of its recreation system, or through the wider use of the school plant; and whether the church, with but a small fraction of the energy which it would expend on the job itself, could not induce the municipality or some civic organization to finance and father it.

Lest it be thought that under these ten headings I have given undue emphasis to the personal responsibility of the pastor as a civic leader, I may be permitted to quote a few lines from Dr. Worth M. Tippy's excellent little book, *The Church a Community Force* (now unfortunately out of print):

> Two important considerations lie at the foundation of the community relations of a church. The first is a conviction that these relations are as truly a part of the work of the church as are its other activities. They are not matters of indifference or choice that may be taken on or omitted without unfaithfulness to the gospel. They are fundamental and are to be planned for and worked out with great patience and earnestness, and sacrifices involved are to be made as a matter of course.
>
> The second is that, if ever a church is to have a community spirit, if it is to become a community force, its pastor must lead it there. Theoretically, laymen might carry through the program independently of the coöperation of their pastor; but as a working fact the pastor is the key

man. If he does not lead his church, it will not go. And if the pastor is to lead, it is necessary for him to become personally involved in the social movement of his community. He must know its uplift forces and its social workers, and, in order to know and to lead, he himself must be one of them.

And lest I be thought Utopian in dreaming that the churches can and should unite in important civic projects, the words of Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, in the new *Handbook of the Churches,* may be quoted:

> The day is past when any realm of our economic, industrial, social, political, or international life will be regarded as outside of the sphere of responsibility of the churches. . . .
>
> When, however, the churches attempt to make their influence felt in molding public opinion on great public issues, they discover that, if they are to do anything effective, they must act far more unitedly than has hitherto been the case.

For the soundness of some of the ideas advanced in this chapter, we have thus the authority of two high officials of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America: the executive secretary of its Commission on the Church and Social Service, and its president, respectively.

If through his local church the minister will become, directly or indirectly, a real civic leader, and if he will regard the other churches in his city, not as rivals, but as allies in the building of a finer community, the day will be brought nearer when our cities, whether set on a hill or not, shall indeed be the light of the world.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL AGENCIES

JOSEPH K. HART

Associate Editor, "The Survey"

A variety of interests and activities in the ministry, social work, and education brought Dr. Hart to a realization of the common goal of all these agencies—the promotion of social welfare—and to a desire to further their mutual co-operation.

His chosen work has been centered largely, however, in the newer forms of educational pioneering. After receiving his doctor's degree from the University of Chicago in 1909, he spent ten years on the Pacific coast as professor of education in the University of Washington and later in Reed College. In 1919 he performed a valuable service in the National War Camp Community Service by planning and organizing training courses for volunteer social workers.

For the past seven years Dr. Hart has been associate editor of *The Survey* and a lecturer in education in the New School for Social Research in New York. During one year, 1921–22, he was director of the Pennsylvania School of Social Work in Philadelphia.

Well known as a lecturer on educational problems in all parts of the country, he has also written extensively. In addition to numerous magazine articles, his books include: *The Educational Resources of Rural and Village Communities, Democracy in Education, Community Organization, The Discovery of Intelligence, Adult Education,* and *Light from the North,* only recently published. The latest volume is a study of modern education in Denmark, and has aroused a keen interest among progressive educators in this country.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL AGENCIES

JOSEPH K. HART

What is a church? Or, perhaps, what is the church? Or, even, what is The Church? Opinions differ—and so do the facts. A church may be a local group of "good" people, without cultural backgrounds or humanistic traditions, who are intent only on finding "salvation" from some sort of "wrath to come." On the other hand, the church may be a part of a world-wide, age-long organization of vital concerns, with a rich cultural tradition, with vested interests in many areas of emotion and doctrine, and with the most expansive humanistic outlooks, but with only an incidental thought for any ultimate "salvation." In America, the church may be "Christian," after innumerable patterns, or Jewish, in fewer patterns: in either case, with something of a slant toward, or away from, "social" concerns. If "Christian," it may be "High" or "Low," Catholic or "sectarian," episcopal or congregational, orthodox or dissenting, evangelistic or rationalistic, modernist or fundamentalist. It may be a local congregation, a provincial denomination, a national or international fellowship; it may be the

membership of the local group; the official board, usually a financial body; the "church workers," who are volunteers and amateurs, for the most part; or the "minister," who in many congregations is about the only paid worker, devoting all his time to the "services of the church," and usually accepted as the authorized mouthpiece of the organization.

Now, in the presence of all these variations in the meanings of the term, what should be the church's relationships to the social agencies of the community? It is an important and a complicated problem, or series of problems.

It becomes far more complicated when we face the next question; namely, what is a social agency? Here too we find wide diversity of opinions and an equal diversity of facts. A "social agency" may be a local group of "good" people, without any sense of determined fact or any real social understanding, who are intent only upon giving expression to their more or less maudlin sentimentalism by "helping" "people who are in need." On the other hand, it may be part of a nation-wide, or even world-wide, organization, like the Red Cross, with enormous machineries for "fact-finding," with far-reaching programs of *social welfare,* but with an almost inevitable diminution of interest in the welfare of specific individuals, and with little "unscientific emotionalism" interfering with the effectiveness of its work. Between these extremes, a "social agency" may turn out to be a group of experts (more or less), at work

on problems of social adjustment and individual need; a corporate body handling certain phases of community deficiency more or less rationally; a humane sentiment working itself out through a technic that is more or less effective. Some of our so-called social agencies are manned by individuals who have never had an idea in their heads; others, by individuals who are nothing but rationalizations of early prejudices; still others, by men and women who boast their "absolute devotion to scientific procedures"—whatever they may mean; and some are manned by modest men and women who admit that they are struggling valiantly with problems which are within themselves as well as in the community and in other men and women, and who feel themselves to be "cases" almost as realistically in need of "social work" as are those others in whose behalf, ostensibly, they spend and are spent.

Now, in the presence of all these variations in the meanings of the term, what should be the church's relationships to the social agencies of the community? It is an important and complicated problem, or series of problems.

It would be easy to say, as is often said, that the churches bring to men the things that make life worth while, while our social and scientific instrumentalities bring to us the means of realizing those "eternal values" in the actual affairs of the day, or of life. But such a statement would not be true—in actual living. A church that is "alive," that is

vibrant with creative purpose, that draws its inspirations from the sources of living waters, may indeed bring to men "things that make life worth while"; but a dead church, walled in with its past, repeating only its ancient meaningless phrases, may stand in the way of all that is "valuable" in life. Likewise, a social agency that has understanding of life, that knows how and where men and women live, and that does not identify "science" with "reality," or "facts" with "satisfactions," may help men and women work out the "values" they long to realize; but a stagnant "social agency," lost in its own outgrown "technics," and prating only of "findings" and "facts," may defeat everything that natural men and women may deem worth while. A dead church deadens living—however much in its origins it may have been the source of living issues. A dead social agency deadens and destroys social adjustments, however much in its origins it may have taught to many the ways to better living. There is no virtue in institutions—when their virtues have been dissipated, and their structures stand as lifeless shells of social hopefulness or hopelessness. There are churches that have lost all right to call themselves religious instruments, since they have gone stale upon life. There are social agencies that have lost all right to call themselves social instruments, since they have gone stale upon their understandings of actual men and women. A church that has nothing but "members" is fit for nothing but outlawry. A social agency

that has nothing but "cases" is fit for nothing but its own demise. If a church does not help create a more profound love of humanity, of community, and of individuality, then it has no place in the affections of modern men and women; and if a social agency does not help create a better community, a more worthy humanity, a more liberal individuality, then it has no place in the support of modern men and women.

Our main difficulty is that "community" and "humanity" and even "individuality" are terms and meanings that have grown too big for us; or maybe we have allowed ourselves to remain too small for them. "We can't be bothered" with trying to grasp them, or to live in their presence. We can get along with fragments of them much better. Instead of "community" we prefer our favorite institutions—the church if we are habituated to churchly things; a party if we are inclined to political activities; our jobs if we are intent on economic "success"; a social agency if we are imbued with reformistic tendencies. It's so much easier to live and enjoy ourselves in fragments of this modern world than it is to live in the whole of it. And we can, without great difficulty, compensate for that fragmentariness by arguing that the sum of our churches, schools, industries, social agencies, and the like makes the total of a "good community," although we *know,* when we face the realities of modern living, that the sum of the parts never equals the whole, and that, almost

universally, our community life is being actually defeated by the multiplicity of these fragmentarian institutions, which we try to make ourselves accept as equivalents of community wholeness. We know that a "church" can easily defeat our best aspirations for the spiritual reality of community living. We know that political parties can easily stand in the way of the realization of civic aspirations. We know that a "job" can readily seduce away a man's interest from his natural vocation. We know that a "social agency" can easily strip a human being of all his individuality and personality, and so transform him into a "case"—to be solved and then recorded as a "statistic." More than all these things, our "social" institutions can insinuate into our very blood the feeling that interest in community or humanity, in the large, is not only impossible: it is equivalent to a sort of insanity! We saw all this on an enormous scale in the propaganda of war-time, when it was held that loyalty to "humanity" was nothing less than treason to specific nations, or even to special classes within the nations!

Our problem herein, then, is not nearly so much that of determining the relationships of *churches* to *social agencies,* just as they stand in the world today; it is that of determining and envisaging the relationships of each, and of both, to something that is more important than either, or than both; namely, *community, humanity, individuality.* That does not mean that institutions are unimportant. It

means that, in our not unnatural devotion to our own prized institutions, we easily lose sight of other equally important, or unimportant, institutions; and above all that we almost universally forget, or ignore, the existence of that all-important *community, humanity, individuality*, which is antecedent to all institutions, and which is the only justification for the existence of institutions at all. Our problem is, not what are the relationships of churches to social agencies *in vacuo,* but what are the relationships of both churches and social agencies to the whole of community living, and what part, if any, shall each of such institutions have in the complete process of community realizations?

Occasionally, as in these pressing years, we realize, a bit uneasily, that churches and social agencies both lie within the picture of the social world, and that they must have some significance for each other, whether they know it or not. So we seek to discover the *relationships between* these impinging institutions, thinking, probably, that such discovery will restore to us a full understanding of the significance of both these institutions. But we are quite mistaken; nothing can give us the meanings of these two institutions, or any other two or more institutions, except the discovery that all are really meaningless and impertinent, save in the light of, and in the midst of, and as instruments of *that wholeness of living,* which is best conveyed by such words as *community, humanity, individuality.* Institutions, in

themselves, have no vested rights—save as they have aggrandized themselves, illegitimately, through the past. Every institution, however religious or "social" it may claim to be, must soon or late answer at the bar of humanity, community, and individuality, and give an account of itself as the servant and instrument of need. It is, of course, something that institutions should, at times, seek to discover their own interrelationships; that means that they are a bit uneasy—and that is always a gain. But a decadent church, or an impertinent "social" agency, cannot overcome its own futilities by merely discovering certain "interesting relationships." The world can't long maintain its spiritual existence on any such summation of its own fragments.

Hence, religious leaders of the present cannot hope to escape from the insistent questionings of the age by saying, more or less glibly, that what the church needs is to feel the "social impulses of the age," or that it must have "social programs," or "social activities." Phrases are the bane of the age. Doubtless churches do need to find something more of that reality that is implied in the word "social." But the word means a multitude of things, not all of which are of equal importance; and many a church has quite completely lost its way by undertaking to make itself a "social agency," or by "becoming interested" in "social activities." Most of the churches which have undertaken activities in

this direction have ceased to be real religious organizations, and have failed to become significant social agencies. They have become lost in disintegrating futilities. A church that has become only an amateurish "social agency" is an object for either pity or scorn; it is not quite clear which.

What both churches and social agencies alike need, and in much the same degree, is that they should find the community in which they exist; that they should discover the humanity which is both their origin and their objective; and that they should learn the meanings of personality, which both are historically set to serve. The real meanings of life are given in community, humanity, and individuality; the primitive rootages of all our institutions were set in these ultimate realities; all our present fragmentary institutionalisms have broken away from those primitive rootages, and they will never discover the reasons for their own existence until they rediscover their own origins, and reënvisage their own human objectives. Nothing is more absurd than the spectacle of a decadent church calling a social agency "heartless" or "soulless," unless it is the spectacle of a fact-worshiping "social agency" calling a church "blundering" or "inefficient." No instrument of all our modern world is more inefficient, or commits more blunders, than the "social agency" that works upon the assumption that life is made up of "facts," and that the social good of a community can be set down in a table of statistics.

There is room in the modern community for churches that can see the community and its spiritual goods. There is room in the modern community for social agencies that are able to see the community and its spiritual goods. Humanity is incurably religious, and it gets all too little help from the churches in its religious needs. Humanity has an incurable sense of artistic wholeness, and it seeks by means of many kinds of social instruments to secure this more wholesome community and personal living; but it gets all too little help from our established social agencies in this direction. Most of our churches—all our Protestant churches—protest that the supreme religious experience is the relationship of the *individual* with his God. This implies the reality of the individual, and his need of convincing experiences. Translated into everyday English, this seems to imply that the objective of all religious effort is the development of *individuality*. But not many churches—not many Protestant churches, even—would accept that translation without protest. The growth of individuality frightens most of us—even our religious leaders. The logic of Protestantism is not yet widely acceptable to Protestants.

Social psychologists are telling us that individuality is a function of enlarging community life; it is Humanity written intensively in the particular person. But not many of our institutions are willing to see their work merged into such indefinite results; they want prestige, and statistics, and the means of

making an impression more than they want wholeness of the community.

Of course, in the large, our churches are supposed to stand for the ultimate values of life, to emphasize the spiritual meanings of existence, and to demonstrate that the final realities of the world are spiritual realities. And our social agencies are supposed to be interested in efficient, "scientific" means of securing more and more of these spiritual values in the lives of "even the least" member of the human aggregate. The church is supposed to be everlastingly saying, "Man cannot live by bread alone: here is that which is more than bread!" And our social agencies are supposed to be saying, always: "True, man cannot live by bread alone; he needs more than bread: but he cannot always find that which is more than bread, or accept it when he finds it, if he lacks that which nothing but bread can give. Hence, even for the sake of that which is more than bread, we seek to make sure that he shall not suffer too much from lack of bread!"

None the less, it is not wholly beside the mark to ask some real questions, as follows: How many of our churches are really convinced that "life" has any "ultimate" values? How many of them actually emphasize real spiritual values *for our times,* rather than ancient symbols of the spiritual values of bygone ages? How many of them are sufficiently convinced of the reality of the spiritual interests of mankind to be willing to risk their own

futures for the triumph of those spiritual interests? Our social agencies may also be interrogated in similar fashion: How many social agencies, or social workers, really know what the word "scientific" implies or means? Does the term "scientific" imply regard for the spiritual, the emotional, the artistic, the creative, in social relationships and in personality, or does it imply the elimination of all such things? Does "scientific" handling of a personal or social situation increase self-respect, or destroy it? disintegrate social and individual organization, or more completely integrate it? Does "science" mean the same thing as "life," or does it mean something different? If something different, does it mean something added to life, or something taken away from life? Can anything be "scientific" that defeats, or destroys, or disintegrates the values of human living?

Now, in the light of these questionings, what shall we say of the relationships of our churches to our social agencies? Or vice versa? It must be obvious, by this time, that nothing important can be said from this present external position in which we inevitably find ourselves. Any significant answer to the question must lie inside that future development of our community imaginations and that realization of our community relationships that will enable us to see the elements involved more clearly than we can see them to-day. The answer to our question is not in the keeping of existent institu-

tions, or current institutional-mindedness. The answer is in the keeping of that future community-mindedness, which can envisage not merely the churches and the social agencies but all our other institutions in the light of that ultimate social objective which is written large as Humanity, and which is written intensively as Individuality. This only we can now say: It is the business of both church and social agency to minister to the development of this great social objective; and their understanding of their own tasks must be such as to enable them to work together to this end, and their relationships to each other must be construed and developed to the accomplishment of the same supreme objective. That objective is not a finality, or a dogma; it is a fluid, a moving congeries of relationships in the midst of the fluid ages. The fluidity of that objective must be permitted to communicate itself, effectively, to the nature of the instruments involved. Hence both the church and the social agency must become *creative instruments* employed in the service of the social ideal, and helping in the endless processes of realizing that ideal.

HOW THE CATHOLIC CHURCH DOES IT

WILLIAM J. KERBY

Acting Director, National Catholic School of Social Service

Dr. Kerby, a native of Iowa, was ordained to the Catholic priesthood at Dubuque in 1892. His early interest in social problems led him to graduate study in the social sciences in the universities of Germany and Belgium, and in 1897 he was given the doctor's degree by the University of Louvain.

Prominent as an active figure in the development of Catholic social work, Dr. Kerby has contributed to its progress by lecturing, organizing, and writing. In 1910 he founded the National Conference of Catholic Charities, directing its work and editing its publications for the following decade. His many articles on industrial and social questions have been published in periodicals and in the *Catholic Encyclopedia.* Among his books are: *The Social Mission of Charity,* an interpretation of the Catholic philosophy of Social Work, and *Prophets of the Better Hope,* an interpretation of the social and spiritual ideals of the Catholic priesthood.

In addition to his present work as acting director of the National Catholic School of Social Service, Dr. Kerby is professor of sociology in the Catholic University at Washington, D. C.

HOW THE CATHOLIC CHURCH DOES IT

WILLIAM J. KERBY

It would seem more in keeping with the instincts of Catholic life to speak of the charities of the Catholic Church rather than of its social work. The authentic eminence given by Christ to charity as the greatest of the virtues has never failed to exert powerful influence in Catholic life. Love of God and of neighbor is fundamental in the divine plan. Charity as a spiritual bond in the Christian life leads to service as an obligation in that life. Circumstances have led to a concentration upon service to the poor as an outstanding feature of this general law. Hence ministration by the strong to the weak is ordinarily indicated by the term "charity." Problems in modern life and deeper insight into poverty as an aspect of social life have widened the concept of service in a way to include action upon society and to lead to preventive work through relief. The use of the wider term "social work" prevails to such an extent, and it is so well warranted in many ways, that its acceptance is indicated as a practical necessity. In as far as the term is current in Catholic life it involves no surrender of the conviction that the service of the poor is fundamentally spiritual,

an organic phase of Christian life. Whether we call this service charity or social work, its motive, law, and compensation remain primarily spiritual. The prevention of industrial accidents may be no less spiritual in motive than is the tender care of the widows and orphans whose helplessness is due to such accidents. In the former case one acts upon society. In the latter case one deals with the individual. In both cases the divine law of love of neighbor and the spiritual obligation of service may be obeyed with equal dignity and effect.

The fundamental principles that lie behind the development of Catholic social work are taken from the teaching and inspired by the example of Christ in respect to the poor. The historical practice of the church has developed out of these roots and has shaped its structure in a most far-reaching way. This is seen in the responsibility of the bishop for the care of the poor, in the pronouncements of general and particular councils of the church, in the creation of religious communities devoted to the care of the poor, in the passionate devotion of the saints to the service of the poor, in the constant outpouring of wealth to their use, in the definition of moral obligation toward the poor as developed elaborately in theological literature. Any large review of the life of the church as a whole cannot fail to reveal the primacy of solicitude for the poor as rooted in the very constitution of the Christian life. This is seen further in the belief in spiritual

compensation for service of dependents. Spiritual advantage to those who serve is kept in mind in unbroken tradition that takes its beginning in the teaching of Christ. Prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, that is to say, worship and petition, self-discipline and service of the poor, are elementary features of the life that is rightly conformed to the teaching of Christ.

The forms taken on in this service are affected in a far-reaching way by social conditions. Neighbor is a spiritual and at the same time social category. When there are few poor, and personal relations between the strong and the weak are possible, service is simple, and it is rendered in the light of full knowledge. In modern life, however, social geography separates the strong from the weak. The latter are numerous, largely segregated, and personal relations become practically impossible. Problems of poverty become complicated, and service is necessarily made systematic and to a great extent impersonal. In this way there arises the necessity of creating organizations, of recording and sifting experience, of testing results and of acting upon social causes of dependency. The original personal relationship between the strong and the weak is replaced by impersonal relations. The trained expert becomes necessary. As insight is deepened and social conditions receive attention, larger sympathies prevail and service is made systematic.

A high degree of specialization in social service

has become necessary. Medicine, psychology, psychiatry, industrial and social research, and elaborate legislation have deepened insight into the problems of poverty and have widened immensely the scope of service. Social work as a profession has taken a commanding place. The adjustment of agencies of service creates many problems of administration and technique. The profession of social work and the exactions of the system separate those who give from those who receive. In this development emphasis upon the social features of service seem to increase while emphasis upon the spiritual quality of service tends to decrease. The Catholic Church does its utmost to maintain the spiritual quality of service in unimpaired integrity. Whatever the distance that separates the strong from the weak, the church aims to hold them in intimate relations, the two supports of the rainbow of the love of God that bridges all distances in the unity of Christian association.

The development of social work in general shows many significant features. Ability of the highest order is attracted toward the problems of poverty. Schools are created in which experts are trained. Literature is produced, of a kind that is most impressive. We have a literature of investigation which brings to attention the facts of poverty; literature of interpretation which traces it to causes; literature of direction in which methods of treatment are set forth as experience approves or modi-

fies them; literature of inspiration which indicates motives and values in the service of the poor.

Catholic social work could not remain unaffected by this development. The *Directory of Catholic Charities* which was published in 1923 shows a very wide range of activities.[1] In all of these

[1] Homes for the aged, 144; industrial schools for Indian, colored, and white children, 112; institutions for specialized training of feeble-minded children, 14; Big Sister and Big Brother organizations with specific or incidental purpose, 15; homes for the blind, 7; boarding homes for girls and women, 120; hospitals for cancer, 3; diocesan bureaus of Catholic charities, 32—increased to 58 in 1926; homes for crippled children, 7; day nurseries, 113; homes for deaf mutes, 14; homes for delinquent boys, 10; homes for delinquent girls, 55; employment bureaus, 23; fresh air homes, 31; shelters for homeless men and women, 15; hospitals, practically all of which include some kind of service of the sick poor, 525; associations doing immigrant welfare work, 17; homes for incurables, 6; hospitals with developed social service departments, 33; infant and maternity homes, 49; hospitals and sanatoria for mental cases, 19; organizations working in conjunction with juvenile courts, 7 (not including those which work with juvenile courts in addition to other activities); maternity hospitals, 33; national organizations which include many varieties of welfare work, 22; orphan homes, 296; associations primarily engaged in work for prisoners, 4 (not including those societies in which work for prisoners is one of many activities); relief societies both national and local other than the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, child welfare societies, women's and girls' clubs, 27; room registries, 22; seamen's welfare associations, 1; social clubs and settlements, 94; schools for social service training, 3 (not including courses of lectures to volunteers or colleges in which social service courses are given); Society of St. Vincent de Paul (a national organization whose primary purpose is work for families and in institutions), 1400 parish conferences, 17,400 active members.

lines the progressive movement is found in varying degrees. Three schools are devoted to the training of social workers. Systematic courses of lectures for volunteers are found in all of our larger cities. Catholic colleges for men and women are introducing courses and departments devoted to the study of problems in poverty and methods in relief. The number of trained salaried workers is increasing. Efforts are made universally to standardize methods of investigation, records, and follow-up work. Members of sisterhoods are trained in increasing numbers for work in the fields to which they devote themselves. The National Conference of Catholic Charities assembles many hundreds of religious and lay workers annually for purposes of discussion and criticism. A National Conference of Sisterhoods engaged in work for children meets jointly with the National Conference of Catholic Charities and, while sharing in the activities of the latter, endeavors to deal with problems peculiar to its own work. Surveys of institutions and of dioceses are made, and plans of development are formulated in the light of results thus found.

There is no section in the entire field of Catholic work that does not show the effect of this development. In particular, one notes the prevalence of a broad outlook upon all problems and all methods. Isolation of agencies and of effort is replaced gradually by more effective coördination.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, a voluntary association of members of the hierarchy, includes in its organization a Department of Social Action, which deals with industrial relations, conducts surveys of social work, maintains contact with all features of organized social work, and promotes the development of standards by lectures and conferences. The Welfare Conference maintains bureaus of immigration with offices in ports of entry for immigrants and operates in conjunction with local organizations in follow-up work and in the adjustment of local problems which arise. The National Council of Catholic Women touches systematically on certain phases of social work and sponsors the National Catholic School of Social Service, in which a two years' course of training is given. Finally, programs of social work are developed by many national, fraternal, and cultural organizations in coöperation with the agencies described.

The distinctive literature bearing on Catholic social work consists mainly of the reports of the National Conference of Catholic Charities; of files of the *Catholic Charities Review,* now in its tenth volume; of the publications of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and of its Bureau of Social Action and of the Women's Council; of the twenty-one volumes of the *St. Vincent de Paul Quarterly,* which was converted into the *Catholic Charities Review* in 1916; of papers read by representative Catholic leaders at national and state conferences

of many kinds; of occasional publications which appear independently; and of reports published by separate organizations in the field.[1]

The development of social work in any diocese, whether done by a national or local organization, proceeds under the authority of the bishop. When conditions in the diocese warrant the step, the bishop appoints a diocesan director of charities, who is his representative in developing standards, promoting coöperation, and directing all relations of the work. There are at present fifty-eight such diocesan directors, an increase of twenty-six since 1923. In nearly all of these dioceses the directors maintain offices with a force of trained workers. The functions of the diocesan office vary with local conditions and the desire of the bishop, as does the adjustment between the central office and all other agencies in the diocese.

While as a matter of fact Catholic social work is primarily concerned with the members of the Catholic Church, this occurs as a matter of practical expediency rather than as the outcome of an intention. While the bond of faith is the basis of sympathy and understanding in work for the weaker

[1] The Catholic Charities of New York City has just published a report of 540 pages on probation and delinquency. It makes known the results of an effort "to demonstrate the full potentialities of probation functioning under favorable conditions, with adequate equipment, resources, and personnel." The report covers a period of two years. It was written by Mr. Edwin J. Cooley, who had charge of the work.

social classes, the bond of humanity is recognized in a way that invites service and assures it regardless of creed or color. Neither institutions nor agencies refuse any service that can be rendered to any human being who is in need. The only limit placed upon the work is due to limitation of personnel and resources. Naturally, of course, power for effective and sympathetic service is greater where the bond of common faith unites those who give and those who receive service.

Since poverty respects neither race, nor faith, nor color, coöperation among all agencies of service is fundamentally necessary. While local circumstances will in the nature of the case affect the degree of coöperation that may be hoped for, in principle effort in the direction of it is fostered as far as possible. In some sections of the country working policies of coöperation appear with excellent effect. Elsewhere through circumstances this development may not proceed so far. Under one type of arrangement all of the interests of a city in respect of work for families and children are coördinate in one central organization. Elsewhere distinctive organizations will be found which come together for purposes of discussion and development of policy through a council of social agencies. When such an organization does not exist, working policies which effect coördination are developed.

The supremacy of the moral law as interpreted by the church from both natural and supernatural

standpoints is recognized as a primary factor in shaping all policies of service to the poor. Every measure of relief, every plan that deals with the dependent family, must meet the approval of the moral law before it is incorporated into Catholic practice. Thus, for instance, birth-control measures are never accepted because they are in conflict with the church's interpretation of the moral law which governs marriage relations. Separation of husband and wife is dealt with with extreme care because of the divine law of union in marriage which is formally taught and sanctioned in the revelation contained in the New Testament. In all plans that involve the separation of children from parents, the divine constitution of the family is held in mind. Every effort is made to find the solution which holds parents and children in the intimate relations of home life. When conditions arise that seem to defeat the normal purposes of family life, steps are taken to meet the situations as they arise. But all of the presumptions of Catholic social work in dealing with the family press effort in the direction of preserving its integrity.

The general temper of Catholic social work leads to preference for private initiative as against action by the State in dealing with dependents. This is the result of the belief that democracy is primarily spiritual and social and secondarily political. Social justice and charity depend mainly upon personal conscience, enlightened public opinion, and a highly

developed social conscience. The more effective social conscience is, the more democratic society becomes. A maximum of order through individual and social conscience with a minimum of coercion through law is the ideal held in mind. Hence the home, religion, education, and public opinion are nobler agencies of reform always. When conditions defy the power of these, dependence upon legislation is indicated. The presumption against action by the State is surrendered, and measures of social legislation are actively supported. The protection of women and children in industry, the support of dependent mothers through public allowances, are instances in point.

Work for children reflects the general development described. The tendency that now prevails leads to treatment of the child in view of its particular needs. Social history, physical and mental characteristics and capacity, are looked into with care, and the treatment of the child is related as nearly as possible to the circumstances of its case. The removal of the child from its own home, the selection of a foster home or of an institution, will be determined as far as possible by the present needs of the child itself. Since experience indicates that many types of children have need of institutional care, the institution remains an important factor in the work. We find the cottage plan fully developed in some localities. Where the physical plant is of the congregate type, the development of small

groups within it is aimed at. Practical difficulties in finding suitable foster homes for children slow down at times the reduction of institutional population when it is desired. Since careful moral and religious training of the child is fundamental in all plans for its care, added difficulty in finding desirable homes is frequently met. The standards of investigation, intake, treatment, records, dismissal, and follow-up work with institution children keep pace with the general development described. These standards have been formulated and published by the National Conference of Sisterhoods engaged in work for children.

The financing of Catholic charities shows a wide range of differences. In some cities active participation in the community chest is found. Elsewhere the community chest is not favored. In some cities distinctive Catholic drives raise a large percentage of the funds required for the work. Again where neither the community chest nor a particular drive is practicable the ordinary methods of soliciting support for social work provide the funds that are required. Bequests constitute in the aggregate an important feature of financing. The vast amount of work done under Catholic auspices is made possible in large measure through the sisterhoods and communities of brothers who give their lives entirely to the service of the poor and afflicted as a form of personal spiritual consecration. The colossal proportions that this form of spiritual renunciation

reaches constitute the most impressive feature of the entire social work of the Catholic Church.

Keeping this general background in mind, we may understand without difficulty the practical operation of Catholic social work as it appears in the everyday life of a parish. The parish is a canonical spiritual and social unit in the life of the church. The pastor is conscious of a deep sense of spiritual responsibility toward the poor. He is in sympathetic relation with the diocesan director of charities, with the religious communities found either in the city or within the parish lines. Every resource of the entire system of service is within his reach as he meets problems. He fosters the development of voluntary organizations of men and women which will undertake the service of the poor as it relates to the integrity of parish life. Nursing sisterhoods who take care of the sick poor in their homes, and hospitals which provide for surgical and medical services, are available. A conference of the St. Vincent de Paul Society or an association of lay women will be prepared always to take care of the problems within their scope. The general policies by which all of these resources are marshaled are subject to the judgment and direction of the pastor. City problems such as the visiting of prisoners and homes for the aged, dealing with Catholic children that come before the juvenile court, providing for unmarried mothers, the care of delinquent girls, are provided for by general arrangement with the agen-

cies that are available. The particular council of the St. Vincent de Paul Society and other city-wide agencies will make provision for services which are called for in the Catholic life of a city and are beyond the competence of the single parish.

While the development of Catholic social work as a whole is uneven, as is inevitable in a field that is so extensive and varied, the evidences of significant progress in every direction are marked. From a Christian standpoint the most important contribution of the Catholic Church to social work is easily indicated. It consists in her strong emphasis on the spiritual quality of all her service of the poor. This abiding conviction, which stands out in every detail, rests on reverent acceptance of the unequivocal teaching of Christ that charity is the greatest of virtues, that the service of the poor is the service of Christ himself, and that the high compensations of this service await those who have loved and served the poor in his name.

CHILD DEPENDENCY

HENRY W. THURSTON

Head of the Department of Child Welfare New York School of Social Work

Born on a Vermont farm, Dr. Thurston early became interested in education, and his activities in that field have ranged all the way from a one-room country school to his work since 1912 in the New York School of Social Work. His studies have centered chiefly in sociology and economics, with especial reference to juvenile problems, in which he gained practical field experience during a number of years as chief probation officer of the Juvenile Court in Chicago, and as superintendent of the Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society.

During the last five years Dr. Thurston's chief outside interests have been as a member of the executive committee of the National Committee of Visiting Teachers, which has carried on a three-year demonstration of visiting teachers in each of thirty communities in the United States; and as a member of the executive committee and for three years as president of the Child Welfare League of America, which is engaged in making more effective the institutional and foster home care of dependent, neglected, and delinquent children all over the United States and in four provinces of Canada.

Among the most important of his publications have been a text-book on *Economics and Industrial History,* a volume on *Delinquency and Spare Time,* the result of a study of recreation in Cleveland, and articles appearing in *The Survey* during the three years when he was a contributing editor.

Drawing from the understanding of the problems of childhood afforded him by his wide experience and study, Dr. Thurston contributes this chapter.

CHILD DEPENDENCY

HENRY W. THURSTON

The church influences child dependency in two ways: first, by its attitude for or against all the means for prevention of dependency through industrial justice, law, civic efficiency, strengthening the family, and the social conduct of individuals: second, by the use it makes directly or indirectly of the various agencies, institutions, and methods of relieving child dependency already existing.

If one thinks over the family relationships of all the dependent children he has known, it will be clear that these children can all be included in three groups:

First, those that can be helped in their own homes by supplementing parental and other home resources.

Second, those for whom some temporary substitute for the natural home must be found.

Third, those for whom some permanent substitute for the natural home must be found.

Relief must come to children in the second and third groups while they live either in an institution or in a family home other than their own.

Space does not permit a discussion of the relation of the church to the complex problem of poor relief as a whole. It is safe to say, however, that the church will be false to its opportunity unless it realizes that any relief of the dependent child in his own home should be adequate and given, not only with love, but with intelligent understanding of its influence on the child's character and the solidarity of the family. Only so will such relief be permanently helpful to the child in developing within him the power and the purpose of self-help. In this great field of relief of children and adults in their own homes, the problem of the church is how to grow in intelligence as to what is adequate and permanently helpful without losing love and personal interest in the children and adults concerned. In spite of all their prejudices against "red tape," the church that is in earnest must study the best methods of "case workers" and the best standards of those public agencies that administer so-called "widows' pensions." Even the best and wisest workers with children, in the words of St. Paul, should never "count themselves to have apprehended," but rather "reach forth to the things which are before"; namely, the development of character and the permanent power of self-help in the dependent children concerned.

As to widows' pensions or mothers' allowances, which are now granted in some form out of public

funds in all but six [1] of our States, the church needs to be intelligently aware of the magnitude of this form of relief and its possible effect upon the need for care of dependent children away from home either in institutions or in foster family homes. Although it is only a little more than fifteen years since this movement started, "It is estimated that at this time [1926], on one date, approximately 130,000 [2] children are receiving public aid in their own homes. If estimate were made of the total number of children in the United States for whom aid should be granted in their own homes, it would be closer to 350,000 or 400,000." Surely the least that the church in any community should do is to know the extent to which help from this source can be made available and, where it is adequate to the needs of any mother with children for whose relief that church feels responsible, to see that it is used.

Turning now to the relation of the church to the care of dependent children in institutions and foster family homes, the special census volume of the United States for 1923 entitled *Children under Institutional Care* gives some of the facts with which the church should be familiar, but leaves uncompiled other facts that would be of value.

For example, we are told that there was a total

[1] U. S. Children's Bureau Publication 162, p. 9 (1926).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 16 (1926).

of 1558 institutions caring on February 1, 1923, for 140,312 dependent and neglected children. Of these institutions 783 (49+%) were administered directly under the auspices of various religious denominations. Compilation has not been made, however, as to the number of children in these church institutions.

We are also told that on the same date, February 1, 1923, there were 313 child-caring agencies caring for 73,278 children in free and boarding foster family homes; of these agencies 69 (22+%) were under church auspices. Of the total number of dependent and neglected children cared for in families other than their own, not all were under the supervision of the 313 child-caring agencies, as some of the institutions also had children in family homes under the supervision of the institutions.

One thing the church can do is to join with other child welfare workers in a request that the next census give as accurate a compilation as possible of the actual number of dependent and neglected children cared for under the various church and other auspices. Without such an official compilation on a common basis of interpretation for all faiths, the magnitude of the dependent child problem dealt with directly by the church in institutions and foster homes must depend upon personal compilations and estimates of doubtful accuracy. On the face of the census figures, assuming the ratios of children to be roughly about the same as the ratios of institutions

and agencies, there would be almost half, or nearly 70,000 dependent children, in institutions under the church, and something more than one fifth, or about 15,000, in foster family homes under church auspices. Whatever the actual numbers, of two things the church may be sure: first, the children both in the institutions and foster family care under church auspices on any one day in the year are numbered not by tens, or hundreds, but by thousands —in institutions by tens of thousands; second, the total number of such children under church care on any one day would during each year have many other thousands added thereto by the endless files of other children straggling out from the doors of their breaking homes in search of at least temporary home and care elsewhere.

What, then, is the opportunity and duty of the church toward both these short-time and long-time refugee children of America?

In the first place the church should face with great courage and intelligence the question of how far the care of dependent children should be undertaken or continued directly under the auspices of the church. In the second place it would seem to be the duty and opportunity of the church to help bring it about that, whether dependent children are cared for under church or lay auspices, the standards of care given shall be the best possible. What the best possible care for each child is depends to a great degree upon his individual personality and his actual

and possible child-parent experiences and relationships. In each case these can only be found out and utilized after careful and intelligent study.

Furthermore, in any community, what is now practically possible toward such ideal care should be studied by church people both in the light of the history of child welfare and in the light of what part each agency and institution, church and lay, should play in the community as a whole.

Briefly, the development trends to date have been these: The first forms of care for dependent children away from their own homes in colonial days were either the mixed almshouse for adults and children or indenture in families where the children were expected to give a full return in work for food, clothing, shelter, washing, and a minimum of schooling. Although these two forms of care [1] survive until to-day, they are both taboo. The process by which the mixed almshouse slowly gave way was this. Both church and other agencies began to build institutions in which children could be cared for separately from the sick, aged, insane, and depraved adults with whom they had to associate in mixed

[1] In the United States Census study—*Paupers in Almshouse*—1923, Table 70, it is stated that during the year 1922 there were admitted to almshouses a total of 4715 children under sixteen years of age. New Mexico, Louisiana, and the District of Columbia were the only States with no such inmates.

For indenture as it works to-day, see *Children Indentured by the Wisconsin State Public School,* Children's Bureau Publication (1925) No. 150.

almshouses. This building of institutions exclusively for dependent children was begun in 1727 in New Orleans by the Roman Catholic Ursuline convent. The Methodist, George Whitefield, established the Bethesda Orphan House in Savannah, Georgia, in 1740. In 1798 in Philadelphia the Catholics started the work for orphans that became St. Joseph's Female Orphan Asylum. In Baltimore, in 1799, St. Paul's Church founded an asylum for destitute girls. Baltimore also established an orphan asylum in 1798, and Charleston, South Carolina, a city orphan asylum in 1790. All of these, except the first, report children under care to the United States Census in 1923. With these and other beginnings before 1800, slowly during the first half of the nineteenth century and with increasing frequency from about 1875 (when States began to make almshouse care of children illegal), institutions, commonly but wrongly called orphan asylums, were built both under church and non-sectarian auspices. Although comparatively few children in the later institutions were whole orphans, and great numbers of them not even half-orphans, it was long a common practice to require surviving parents and relatives to surrender complete control and guardianship of all the children accepted until they were sixteen or eighteen years old and sometimes during minority. This practice tended to lengthen a separation from surviving parents and kin from what needed to be only a temporary period into a permanent one. Thus kin-

ship assets were often not used so much as they might have been and families were sometimes permanently broken up that might have been reunited. This institutional care for dependent children, however, was in the main a great improvement upon the care that had formerly been given in a mixed almshouse with adults.

In a similar way, indenture of a child in a foster family home with the express intention of making the child pay in full by work until majority, or until a certain age, has since 1853 been slowly giving way to placement and supervision, especially of young children, in family homes where on the basis of affection they are wanted for adoption or as permanent members of the family without adoption. The New York Children's Aid Society founded in 1853, and the so-called State Children's Home Societies (really private agencies each operating all over a State), started in 1883 in Illinois, were the leaders in promoting this form of free foster home care. Except for the whole orphan and for children whose homes were irremediably broken or unfit, this form of care also, like the institution, has frequently had a tendency to substitute a permanent care of dependent children away from their own homes and surviving kin for a care that really needed to be only temporary.

Therefore, to supplement both institutional care and free foster home care, there has been developing slowly since about 1870 what is commonly called

child-placing in boarding foster homes. The State of Massachusetts, directly under State auspices, and various private agencies in Massachusetts have taken the lead in this form of care. Later, many agencies in other States both east and west, and recently also institutions, both church and lay, have been increasingly using this form of temporary care for dependent children away from their own homes.

This form of foster family care can be as temporary as the whole situation of the child's own family makes desirable. Also because of pay for the extra expense involved and with good supervision it can protect the child from overwork, and insist on school attendance, medical care, suitable clothing, and such association with brothers and sisters and surviving parents and other relatives as the whole family situation makes most desirable.

In brief, there have been developed during the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century the three forms of care for dependent children, called institutional, free foster home without indenture, and boarding foster home care. It is the opinion of many of the leading child welfare authorities that no one of these three forms of care of children away from their own homes is adequate to meet the needs of all the dependent children of a given community or church constituency.

If this view is correct, any church institution or agency that depends solely upon one of these methods for care of dependent children away from their

own homes will fail to give the service to some children that they most need. Such churches should ponder earnestly the meaning of a stern utterance recently made by a leader in one of the Protestant denominations that was supporting an institution that was removing children far from their home communities, separating children unnecessarily from their own kin, accepting many others for longer periods than were necessary, and not taking proper care of any of the children accepted.

This utterance [1] is couched in language befitting the theology of the group he was addressing, but its meaning and philosophy are unmistakably clear to readers of any other religious or even non-religious group:

> No care for the dependent child is sufficiently good so long as better care is available.
>
> In all work for dependent and neglected children the child is, or should be, the end; all else is or should be means only.
>
> That genuine loyalty to a Christian denomination is identical with loyalty to Christ, and that whenever a child welfare institution is created or sustained for its own sake or for denominational glory, it becomes disloyal to Christ. In

[1] Dr. George C. Enders, dean of the Christian Divinity School, Defiance, Ohio, in a paper on some experiences of a church in developing a new child welfare policy, given before a Child Welfare Conference held in New York, April 21-22, 1927, under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the Child Welfare League of America.

other words, what is frequently thought of as church loyalty in work with children is frequently nothing more than misdirected sentiment.

Happily in each of the three dominant religious faiths of our country there are already alert leaders who are beginning to promote a gradual readjustment of the work of church institutions and agencies. This readjustment is in the direction of providing for every dependent child the particular kind and term of care that he as an individual, and because of his particular child-parent and child-home experiences and relationships, really needs!

With this ideal in mind there are a few leaders in each faith who are using a part of the church money that formerly would all have been spent for care of children in institutions or in foster homes to support some children at home with their own mothers. Also some leaders are spending a part of their church funds for follow-up care of children in their own homes and elsewhere after they leave institutions and foster family homes.

In brief, the direction forward is already clear, and some church workers are already entering upon the way that leads to the individualized care for the dependent child that we would like our own loved boys and girls to get if we should be separated from them.

This chapter may well be closed with a summary

of a paper given by Mr. H. W. Hopkirk before the conference of Protestant institutional delegates already mentioned.

The speaker, as a member of the staff of the Child Welfare League of America, in the Department of Institutional Care of Children, has for more than three years, in addition to his work with other institutions, been specially charged with the duty of studying and working with institutions under Protestant auspices. The writer of this chapter is firmly of the opinion that, while the speaker had institutions under Protestant church auspices in mind, his words have deep significance to church institutions of other faiths.

The standards of church institutional care and of child-placing range from the lowest to the very best to be found in this country. Between these two extremes lies the great part of the work.

Three problems have demanded our attention above all others.

First, there is the need for better planning of the work in order to avoid duplications with the consequent surplus of service found in many communities for dependent and neglected children while other types of children in the same communities remain without service.

The second problem is to be found in the inadequate staffing of institutions. This inadequacy has to do with the quality as well as the size of staffs.

The third problem is related to the other two and may be described in three words—inadequate social policies.

Regardless of the type of work it is doing, an institution needs to be sure that it is a vital part of the child welfare equipment of the community.

Few of those who found institutions, whether under church or other auspices, have realized that the greatest financial responsibility is not that of providing new buildings but of providing for the annual budget for operating expenses.

Those who give money in large or small amounts are usually attracted by denominational loyalties rather than by thoughts of economy in the care of the community's children.

The cottage or house mother is one of the greatest of institution problems. . . .

Of course the cottage should be built for the children, but if in the building of it we ignore the limitations and needs of the house-mother we will find that the children who live with her in the cottage will feel the pinch when she is overworked or dissatisfied because of inadequate living quarters.

The group units are too large, often containing as many as twenty-five to thirty children.

Salaries are usually inadequate, weekly relief and annual vacation are usually inadequate, and in most places we find entirely missing any plan to recruit or train house-mothers for their very exacting work. . . .

The general failure to improve the conditions under which house-mothers work constitutes the greatest limitation to the internal administration of institutions.

The third outstanding need is for more adequate social policies. This is to be supplied largely through the use of social case work. This is as much needed for our child-placing as for our institutional work, and I believe we can apply the same test to our mothers' assistance work.

Probably not more than ten per cent of our institutions

make adequate use of case work. Many do not even know what it is.

To me case work means more careful scrutiny of the liabilities and resources of the individual and his family followed by constructive planning and treatment. I have learned from superintendents of institutions that Doctors of Divinity and Doctors of Medicine will often fail to appreciate social values when they recommend a child for admission to an institution. It is their (ministers' and doctors') lack of social understanding rather than any lack of truthfulness which causes the trouble.

Institution workers often think of intake as the only place where case work is most needed. After care is just as much of a problem as is intake. There are three links in a case work program: intake service, care of the child while he is at the institution, and (the third link) outgo service and after care. Much devoted service of institution staff may be largely wasted or entirely lost if you leave one link out of this case work program.

To sum up in a word, the relation of the church to child dependency in every community should be one of complete understanding and constructive use of all the community resources, lay as well as church, and also of unselfish helpfulness to the end that every child should get the care he needs, whether in his own home, in another family home, or in an institution. To paraphrase the words of Dean Enders, already quoted, loyalty to any particular church or denomination that results in failure to promote the best care of dependent children actually possible in the community is disloyalty to the Founder of the church.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

MIRIAM VAN WATERS

Referee, Juvenile Court of Los Angeles County

The Boston Children's Aid Society became Miss Van Waters's field upon receiving her Ph.D. from Clark University in 1913. Later she was for three years superintendent of Juvenile Hall in Los Angeles, during one of these years acting also as superintendent of El Retiro School for Girls. Subsequently she was made a member of the board of directors of the National Probation Society.

Since 1921 she has been carrying on her present work as referee of the Juvenile Court of Los Angeles County. In this court she hears all the cases of girls under twenty-one and boys under thirteen. An added undertaking during the last few months has been the directorship of the Division of Juvenile Delinquency in the Harvard Law School Crime Survey. The results of this research have furnished the chief materials for this chapter.

The reading public has been given the benefit of Miss Van Waters' study and experience through her book, *Youth in Conflict,* and through a number of magazine articles, notably a recent series in *The Survey Graphic* on Modern Parenthood.

She is now recognized as one of the leading authorities on juvenile delinquency in the United States. Her conclusions demand national attention.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

MIRIAM VAN WATERS

It is customary in this day of civic pride to view our child welfare institutions with complacency. Community chest drives and the appeals of individual organizations for public support tend to give us the idea that every need is being met, that there is abundant solicitude for the homeless, neglected, offending, and defective child. The average good citizen no more questions the provision made for delinquents than he does the purity of the city's water supply. It is something to be cared for by those whose specialty it is.

People who have never seen the inside of a jail, juvenile court, reformatory, or detention home go about making speeches on the causes and treatment of juvenile delinquency, giving the impression that all is well.

All is *not* well. No community has made adequate provision for dealing with its juvenile delinquents. Penal methods are constantly in use. Barbarities (the term is here misplaced, for we have a modern civilized machinery for handling child of-

fenders which drags into its net children whom another age probably would not have considered offenders) against children are constantly being committed.

The first duty of the church is to follow the ancient injunction of visiting the prisoner in his place of imprisonment, the child in his place of detention. This is not a matter which can be left safely to some professional jail-visitor hired for the purpose. The temptation is too great, even for the prison chaplain, to fall in line with the administration. The enormous insight which comes to a layman in penal matters in his first contact with the terrible instruments of criminal procedure is an experience which every churchman should have. Why not? He visits hospitals, homes, orphanages; he attends Rotary meetings, conferences, and conventions; why not follow his parishioner into the heart of his most trying ordeal? It is often said that those who become delinquent have had little contact with the church. Yet many have been members of church and Sunday-school.

A good beginning would be for the clergyman to follow the record of every delinquent child in his parish. How did he become delinquent? What was done by home, school, church, or social agency to save him? Who reported his case? Did the police arrest him? Was he taken to a police station and housed even for a few hours with adult criminals? Who gave his name and picture to newspapers?

Was it some official eager for publicity, or was the newspaper man on the spot? What effect did this have on the child's reputation in his neighborhood? Was it a true story? A little boy of eleven broke into a school-house through the window and stole some athletic goods. The newspaper story said the damage was four hundred dollars. Investigation revealed the fact that fifty dollars would have covered everything. Who is there to protest in such cases? Then, after the arrest, did the police notify the probation officer or the juvenile court as the law in many places requires them to do? Did the probation officer act promptly? Did the judge hear the case in a perfunctory manner, or did he carefully investigate the child's family life, and proceed, if necessary, to administer to the child's need of correction and guidance in the spirit of a "wise parent"? If the child was put on probation, did the school reject him? Was the disgrace such that the child met it with bravado or shrinking? Did he absent himself from church or Sunday-school? Did the probation officer ever pay him a home visit? Did politicians interfere? Did any agency in the community coöperate with the child in his lonely struggle to make good?

Or if he was sent away to an institution, was this a just thing to do, or a necessary thing? Was any one concerned with trying to rehabilitate the home and make it fit to receive the child on his return? Was the institution properly managed? Did any

member of the church community visit him there? Was any adult whose conduct was responsible for the child's delinquency punished? If the minor was a girl, was there any sex discrimination? What sort of life will the child lead when he or she comes out? How many are there in your neighborhood who have done the same things yet were never caught or punished? Is anything in the community being done to lessen the numbers of those who will become delinquent?

At first sight the churchman is likely to say: "This is no concern of mine. I cannot pass judgment on the good or bad work done by public officials and others handling delinquents, any more than I can allocate to myself the business of making diagnosis and giving treatment in cases of physical sickness. It is a job which belongs to the expert."

True, but in this matter of dealing with conduct the church has a vital concern. People go through courts because they violate laws regulating human behavior. Problems of conduct are definitely within the field of the church, for the church together with the law is the great value-determining agency of human society.

The physician knows about diet and certain physical things which can be done for the child; the psychiatrist, if he is wise, knows how desirable habits can be acquired, and how much conditioning it is necessary to do to change undesirable emotional outlets; the social worker knows the technique of carry-

ing out the recommendations of the physician and the psychiatrist; but only the law in its field, and the church in its field, can determine what values should be fostered, at what expense, in the whole process.

The artist may spring up and say: "Give us maladjusted individuals! You are making a mistake in stressing normality. Normality is dull, uncreative, and often hideous." The mother may say: "It may be true that my excuses of my son have softened his fiber and made him delinquent, but the family is sacred, and family love is the greatest thing in the universe. Do not separate mother and child, even for his own good."

The business man may say: "This regulation of dance halls, hotels, and movies is bad business; it gives our city a bad name. The few must be sacrificed to the many; and for the many, unrestricted economic prosperity is best." Or he may say: "We need more crime-repressing commissions, longer and harder sentences, abolition of probation and parole; we must protect our automobiles and our property."

The politician may say: "Public order and well-being depend on stability. It may be true that a given policeman, judge, probation officer, or institution superintendent is basically disreputable, careless, or inefficient, but he is a friend of *So-and-so* and must be retained."

All these individuals stress something important, a value to be conserved. It remains for the courts to discriminate between these "rights in conflict,"

and to decide which shall prevail, or what combination; and it remains for the church to enunciate the great goals toward which we ought to strive.

Ministers are notoriously inadept in complex political community struggles. Frequently they are found on the side of destruction rather than construction. They join the hue and cry that sends many an honest, humane, lovable official to his doom. This is because they do not know first-hand of his work. They deal in abstractions and know nothing of concrete cases. It would be impossible for an honest clergyman to go astray if his starting-point was his interest in the well-being of the individual child.

Leaving out of consideration the possible lack of skill which ministers share with other citizens in dealing with the practical problems of administration in matters of juvenile delinquency, it is nevertheless true that we as social workers must look to the church for ethical map-making, if the church is to have value to us. Hence it follows that the church has a definite responsibility for knowing and caring about the treatment given those who violate ethical and legal standards. We might describe this as the church's primary and positive duty in relation to juvenile delinquency.

There are other derivative or constructive duties. The church should appeal to youth. The provision for their needs should include the things of the spirit.

This from a layman sounds like an impertinence;

but the fact is that the modern church has provided schools, classes, clubs, gymnasiums, kitchens, lunch-rooms, bowling-alleys, music, games, libraries, swimming-pools, a meeting-place for young people, but with noteworthy exceptions has not given them the bread of life. Two things are required: the personality of the minister with clear ideas of love, faith, loyalty, courage, and steadfastness; and the power, the technique, of an expression suited to the young.

The first depends on forces beyond the scope of this article, the second on an understanding of the rudimentary principles of pedagogy and psychology. Saints, like scientists, may obscure their message in terms unsuited to the vigorous life of reality which our young people lead; but the churchman, unlike the scientist, has the inspiration of great teaching to guide him.[1]

Vulgarization of spiritual teachings is not needed. It is terrible to use the methods of "publicity," of salesmanship, in dealing with religion; and young people whose attention has been caught momentarily by comparison of the great leaders of religion to movie, baseball, or commercial heroes will turn away as soon as the shock wears off. The method which is required is a return to a simple earnest pedagogy flowing from a concrete grasp of the

[1] See *Great Teachers and Mental Health*, by William Burnham, Ph. D., Macmillan Co., 1926, chapter on "Jesus—as a teacher of the young." This is a book that should be read by all those who seek to guide youth.

truths of life, birth, death, struggle, defeat, victory, and sacrifice.

The family is a good place to begin. The minister should know the family life of to-day, the problems of the parent-child relationship, the innumerable difficulties which beset parents and children. If, as Pierre Bovet [1] has pointed out in his book on the growth of religious feeling in the life of the child, the child first learns of God in his knowledge of his father, then the problems of family relationship, the mutual courtesy, obligation, responsibility, antagonism, and comfort growing out of this relationship should be the foundation for teaching religion to the young.

It is obvious that doctrinaire discussions should not be food for young people. These discussions are like family disputes; they have their place, but as the child is entitled to security and tranquillity in his home, so he should be in his church. If we take care of concrete cases of right and wrong, abstractions will take care of themselves. If the church is to assume leadership of children, it must have beauty and fervor, not formalism, nor too much logic, but tenderness, virility, and passion. The emphasis should be on personality, the invisible things made flesh. The church turned social worker will never accomplish this; though the church will die unless social service be one of its aims, the mere provision of the social worker's technique will never save souls.

[1] Director of Rousseau Institute, Geneva, Switzerland.

The church too must value human life more than institutions, must face the issue of the individual struggling to meet the demands of the modern social order. Since the institution is itself a human product, grown up in response to a situation, there cannot be an irreconcilable conflict between the life-blood of a growing healthy institution and the needs of the individual. It is only when the institution is already dead, and the human being is thoroughly alive, that the conflict appears insoluble.

The juvenile delinquent is primarily the product of civilization. We call him maladjusted. It may be that we are maladjusted and that the young offender is reacting in the only way possible to him to our sordid city streets, our crowded homes, mechanical schools, debased public opinion, lifeless churches.

The juvenile delinquent is always the product of a social infection. It is a phenomenon of imitation of adult pursuits which flourish in every social group, for the most part unchecked or condoned. The young are recruited systematically. They learn their lessons with ruthless logic from law-breaking individuals, who often stand high in the community, but are too skilled in deception or hypocrisy to be caught, or too powerful to be punished. Our duty is understanding and prompt, intelligent, wise, and warmly human treatment. The church should never aline itself on the side of brutal or mechanical force.

Sometimes we find very efficient machinery for dealing with delinquents; it may fulfil all its aims,

and be all the more mischievous on that account. Were we not blinded by tradition, it would be presumptuous for a mere social worker to seek to explain to ministers that their greatest opportunity for service lies in a whole-hearted return to the attitude and the wisdom of Jesus.

Virtue will not die out of young people. We find it flourishing in unexpected places, the court, detention home, reformatory, cabaret, and police court. Some fundamental issue arises that calls for courage and loyalty, for truth-telling and devotion, and out of chaos springs up the immortal radiance of a human being, brought face to face with a crisis.[1] Some degree of sophistication is required of clergymen as of physicians. They must not be too easily shocked. Their hold on fundamentals should be so strong that the surface vulgarity of modern youth will not loosen it. The young shelter their helplessness behind a mask of indifference and scorn or boredom, but their need for spiritual guidance and inspiration and their capacity to receive it was never greater than it is to-day.

Juvenile delinquency, contrary to the impressions we receive from the press, is not increasing; it is decreasing. The National Probation Association[2] has compiled statistics which show for Massachusetts and New York a decrease in numbers brought

[1] Jack Black, *You Can't Win*, The Macmillan Company, 1927, a remarkable book which no student of delinquency should overlook.

[2] Secretary, Charles Chute, 370 Seventh Avenue, New York.

before the Juvenile Court amounting to ten per cent. as compared with ten years ago. Studies of the Federal Children's Bureau [1] show in ten American cities a downward juvenile delinquency trend in the majority of them. Every churchman should be familiar with these studies.

While admonition is necessary from the pulpit in reference to our modern home life, it is not well to fill parents with fear that conditions are vastly worse than they used to be. There is marked improvement in the health and education of young people. While unwholesome living goes on in many groups, the evidence of cold statistics leads us to the belief that the delinquency rates for the majority are decreasing.

The rôle of the church in this struggle with delinquency is to be everywhere on the side of child welfare, no matter how much it costs. It will cost a great deal. For the individual who champions the cause of the child against adult greed, carelessness, and tradition will for many years to come be unpopular, with a supreme opportunity to exercise the virtues of courage and self-abnegation.

[1] Grace Abbott, Chief, Washington, D. C.

THE SOCIAL SETTLEMENT RELIGION AND THE CHURCH

In the social interpretation of the Christian faith and its application to common life, Graham Taylor was one of the pioneers. His first pastorate gave early indication of this emphasis. Later, his transforming of a forlorn and stranded church in down-town Hartford into one of the outstanding "institutional" churches of the country led to his selection as professor of practical theology in Hartford Theological Seminary.

It is with civic and social effort in Chicago, however, that his name has been mainly identified. When, in 1892, he was chosen by Chicago Theological Seminary as the first professor of social economics in any theological faculty, he stipulated that he must be free to bring himself and his students into first-hand contact with life. To this end he established Chicago Commons, a social settlement where he and his family took up their residence in a cosmopolitan ward of working people. From this vantage-point his influence has been far-reaching. He has been active in every effort for better housing, city planning, larger provision for recreation, and other measures for civic welfare. He served as a member of the Chicago Vice Commission, whose report initiated a new epoch in dealing with the social evil in this country. He founded and served for many years as president of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, one of the first training centers for social work. In 1914 he was president of the National Conference of Social Work.

On the platform and with his pen Graham Taylor has ever struck the human note and stood for a democratic faith in our fellow-men. For twenty-four years his weekly contributions to the editorial page of the *Chicago Daily News* have constituted his "civic pulpit," as Victor Lawson described it. He established *The Commons,* one of the magazines which joined with others to make *The Survey,* of which he has been for years an associate editor. His volume on *Religion in Social Action* expresses his emphasis on the teaching of religion "from the ground up and not from the clouds down."

THE SOCIAL SETTLEMENT RELIGION AND THE CHURCH

GRAHAM TAYLOR

A religious motive and an education method inspired the initiative and have characterized the development of the settlement movement. Occasion was given in 1883 for the expression of this initial motive by a group of city missionaries in East London, who, discouraged by the odds against realizing religious ideals and standards of living, published their *Bitter Cry of Outcast London.* By vividly describing the economic and social conditions which thwarted their own ministries and the church's mission, they hoped to rally city-wide interest and effort to counteract, if not to transform, this impoverishing and demoralizing situation. Their cry startled London not only, but all England.

One of the first to take advantage of the feeling thus aroused was the Rev. Samuel A. Barnett, then vicar of St. Jude's Church on Whitechapel Road, East London, which the bishop of London considered "the most wretched parish" in the city. It was then that Mr. Barnett secured from fellow-alumni

at Oxford University a response to his many previous appeals which enabled him to establish the first settlement house and rally its resident household of university graduates. Thus arose Toynbee Hall, named in honor of Arnold Toynbee, who had become foremost forerunner of the settlement resident groups by coming from Oxford to East London to pay the debt which John Ruskin told his students "English learning owed to English Labor." There and then also the settlement movement became distinctive for its broadly religious spirit and its predominantly educational aim and method.

True to the university spirit the settlement emphasizes the universal in distinction from the exclusive, what is common to all humanity above everything that separates or divides fellow-men. It disclaims adherence to any class or race, to any sect or party, yet seeks to serve them all. It affords freedom for individual initiative and coöperative effort in distinction from the propaganda of creed and cult, or from the restrictions of merely exclusive social and political distinctions. It recognizes and respects real religious and other differences, yet aims to offer common ground to all their adherents, where, without compromise of principle or preference, they can meet, mingle, and exchange values in coöperation for the common good. Respectful toward the distinct prerogatives and functions of the church and the synagogue, the settlement never claims to substitute anything for them, much less to fulfil the function

of either. Even across the frontier in the rear where the churches are conspicuous for their absence or their feebleness, the settlement disavows being in any sense a substitute or a rival of the church or the mission.

On the other hand it is surely no discredit to mission or church that it is not, and cannot be, a settlement, in strict accordance with its original purpose. Each would abandon its distinctive function if it became the other. If a church ceased to press the propaganda of its faith it would cease to be a church of that faith. If the settlement undertook to encroach upon the prerogatives of the church or to show preference for any one cult or creed by maintaining competing religious services itself, much more by claiming to be a church, it would forfeit its own prerogative of being common ground, the clearing-house, the coöperative center of the whole community, for the fellowship and work of those of all faiths and no faith, of all parties or none. In this event it might be promptly and disastrously boycotted and ostracized.

The settlement is confined to one of two courses: either to take the whole crowd along with it together as far as it will go, stopping short of divisive points in religion; or to take far fewer as much further as we would like to have them go, and run the risk of having no following at all where the racial transformation of the community becomes more rapid and radical. The broadly religious spirit

actuating Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jew, and Ethical Culturist is shared by the settlement, but it can offer no creed or ritual which would be a common denominator among the heterogeneous constituency of most settlements.

The church on the other hand legitimately and avowedly takes up those who will go further, and leads the fewer as far as it can get them to go in the direction of its distinctive ideals. The church necessarily divides the community into groups of people who will and can be thus specialized. The settlement comprehends and unites all these groups, and others besides, on the common ground and within the all-embracing framework of neighborship and fellow-citizenship.

There is no reason why this periphery of a circle should be discredited for not being one of the greater segments of the circle which converge toward the supreme center. There is no more reason why a settlement's right to be and its room to work should be challenged, because it is not a church or mission, than that a public school should be denied its function because it is not a parochial school, or that a parish should be discounted because it is not a ward of a city, or that the church communion should be minimized because it is not the community, or that an ecclesiastical denomination should suffer from invidious comparison because it is not of the body politic.

While the functions of a settlement and of a

church or mission are so distinct that neither can fulfil the whole purpose of the other, yet each contributes to the other's fulfilment of its own function. The churches necessarily divide a community by the very depth of the religious conviction which their denominational differences emphasize. Therefore, no one of them, nor all of them together, do or can become the center at which a whole heterogeneous population will or can come into fellowship or coöperation. But the loyalty to ideals, to truth, and to standard which the church begets in each true member is susceptible of being developed into those neighborhood, social, and civic loyalties which the settlement weaves into community spirit and action.

If the settlement attempts to teach distinctive and therefore divisive religious tenets, it is sure to fail in fulfilling its function to the community as a whole, and to those very persons and classes needing its fellowship the most. But it can and does welcome churches and adherents of all religious faiths to use its buildings, and it coöperates with them by encouraging all of its neighbors to receive and live up to the faith they inherit or prefer. Thus at Chicago Commons, under the same roof, on the same common ground, and on the same day, have statedly gathered, in separate groups and rooms, a Protestant church and many Roman Catholic orders; Armenians who are converts of the foreign missions in Turkey and others who adhere to the old Armenian Church; Greeks, some of whom

are still sons of the Orthodox Greek Church, others who belong to the old Uniat Branch of the Roman Catholic Church, and still others who came from their fatherland as Protestant converts. But they could not be drawn or driven together in any religious service.

How sacred is the confidence which is reposed in the settlement by parents of so many faiths in committing their children to our care and guidance is borne home to one's conscience and heart by imagining one's self to be in the place of any of the others. How deeply would any parent resent the breach of such a trust if those to whose social care his or her children had been committed were found to be covertly using the settlement building and its neighborhood fellowships and activities to estrange or detach the child from the faith of its parents! On the other hand it is entirely fair, right, and highly desirable for a church or a mission openly and avowedly to use social methods and equipment as tributary to its distinctively religious purposes and services. But the church which adopts such social methods does not thereby become a settlement, and should not in justice either to itself or the settlement call itself such. Recognizing the "diversities of operations" of "the same spirit," the church may wisely and well acknowledge that its own organization can seldom be considered the best executive of all its own ideals.

That there is both need and room for such an

inclusive and unifying or interpretative function as a settlement may fulfil, can scarcely be denied or seriously questioned by the most exclusive churchmen. Certainly citizens who face the stern fact of the racial and sectarian class cleavages in our unprecedentedly mixed population should appreciate the ministries of understanding, mediation, and good-will fulfilled by the settlements sufficiently to safeguard them from being misunderstood and suspected because of any confusing sectarian misuse of their name.

Relying upon other agencies to carry on and out many things it initiates and helps support, the church may religiously reserve itself to fulfil its supreme prerogative and function of revealing the divine ideal of life, individual and collective; inspiring individuals and groups to aspire to it, and generating spiritual power to attain the ideal in personal experience and character, in public service and social progress.

In distinction from religious propaganda and its ecclesiastical expression, religion finds broad yet intensive expression in settlement life and work. The religious convictions of each resident worker in a settlement household are respected and encouraged, whether Protestant, Jewish, or Catholic. A common, though always voluntary, expression of religious fellowship may be offered by silent or oral grace at table and in household vespers which prompt the highest expression of social fellowship, as our

experience at Chicago Commons attests. The same respect and encouragement for every neighbor's faith and church are expressed by settlement residents and are inculcated in the neighborhood.

If the settlement respects the claim and distinct function of each parish as one of the essential organized groups constituting its neighborhood, and if the parish recognizes and values the settlement as a non-sectarian neighborhood group serving the community as a whole, then each may be in cordial fellowship and active, reciprocally helpful coöperation with the other, and the community may best be served by both.

Thus the religion of relationship Godward and manward is interpreted, exemplified, and incarnated by the settlement household. It stands for nothing higher and nothing less than to realize those divine ideals of relationship between father God and fellow-men, which both Judaism and all forms of Christianity seek to realize and obtain. But where they cannot be preached out and prayed in, the settlement worker can live them out and love them in by reverential ministries to the commonest human needs, by simplifying, sweetening, strengthening, and fulfilling the common relationships of the family, workaday, and community life, by applying the common faith to the social conditions of the common life, by inspiring and encouraging each neighbor's development of his or her own ideals where those of others cannot be superimposed, thus

"letting the spiritual, unbidden and unconscious, grow up through the common."

Neither the church nor the settlement should be allowed either to forget or ignore what religion and the social movement owe to each other. The social movement cannot even be accounted for apart from the monotheism of the religion of Israel, which made possible any conception of the unity of the race or any consciousness of the solidarity of humanity. The religious sanction upon the sacredness of the person, and the self-consciousness of the individual as separable from the primitive group in which he had been merged, are the contributions of the Hebrew prophets and Jesus the Christ to the evolution of social justice and political freedom that date from their days. Until they made one man count one, neither equality before the law nor the democratic State was possible. Until men were conscious of the fatherhood of God they could not conceive the brotherhood of man, much less enlist in sacrificial service to realize it. So identical in origin and in expression are the spirit of religion and the social spirit that they cannot be distinguished from each other.

Deeper and more far-reaching than any other influence of the social spirit, as exemplified by the settlements, has been its effect upon religious thought, feeling, and work. This influence has mediated between form and spirit, the material and spiritual, the secular and religious, the temporal and

eternal, the circumstantial and the essential, the excrescent and the elemental, the world and the church, the ecclesiastical and the social, sectarianism and catholicity, the human and the divine. As much, if not more, than any other influence, the settlement spirit has humanized religion and thus made it all the more divine. It has related church and community so closely that the success of neither is seen to be possible if the other fails.

When religion strikes the earth under the feet of the common man it arouses him as nothing else does or can to stand upon his own feet and demand the common right to a standard of living befitting every child of God. Then the churches are led, or are obliged by consistency with the ideals they teach, to respond to this challenge with demands upon their own constituency not only, but also upon the resources of the community and the State to even up the odds and to assure more of an equality of opportunity.

Thus the old burden of the salvation of the soul has made mandatory the social salvation. Forty years ago only lone voices were heard crying in an unheeding wilderness for this social expression of the spiritual ideal. Now social service commissions equip all religious bodies, Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish, for serving their own communities and the nation, and their ministries are being trained for the social interpretation and application of religion.

Reciprocally interdependent and serviceable to each other are the church and the settlement both in the unity of their religious spirit and in the coöperative service they may render in their distinctive spheres of influence and action.

The influence of social settlements upon the policy of religious bodies toward their local and civic communities is registered not only in the adoption of social methods by the churches, but far more by three great advances toward identifying church life and work with the social and industrial democracy of the age. Thus "soul" has come to mean the whole human self, nothing that one has, but all that one is, or is coming to be, in body, mind, and spirit. The parish has become so identified with the community that in many localities the church has ceased trying to build itself up out of the community and is devoting its energies to building up the community out of itself. The catholicity affirmed by the Apostles' Creed is coming to imply as its equivalent the interdenominational, interracial, and international faith and practice of every religious body. The confession, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints," is coming to be regarded as not only meaningless but as a hollow mockery when and where sectarian prejudice and intolerance, racial antipathies and fratricidal antagonism, and world warfare between so-called Christian nations are tolerated, extenuated, or made possible. Whether the world is to be made safe for democracy depends

upon whether the religion of the world becomes more democratic, and whether the social spirit of the democracy becomes less materialistic and more spiritual.

USING A CASE TECHNIQUE

FRANK J. BRUNO

PROFESSOR OF APPLIED SOCIOLOGY
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Like many other leaders in social work, Dr. Bruno was educated for the ministry. This background gives him especial sympathy with the present problem of relating the influence and work of the church to the needs of our social order. After graduating from the Yale Divinity School in 1902, he was in the active ministry for five years. In 1907 he became general secretary of the Associated Charities in Colorado Springs, and later assumed a similar post in Minneapolis. During the ten years spent in Minneapolis he taught in the Department of Sociology of the University of Minnesota, as acting head of the department and of the Training School for Social Work for three of these years.

Among Dr. Bruno's "extra-curricular" activities have been offices in state conferences and committees, to which he has contributed the benefit of his executive experience. During the war he directed the Northern Division of the Red Cross. He has carried on his present work since September, 1925.

USING A CASE TECHNIQUE

FRANK J. BRUNO

Social case work is a way of dealing with behavior based on the assumption that human acts are genetically related. This is not a startling position. The facts of behavior, the general idea of habit, how it is formed, its dominant place in determining action (an idea which is all but universally shared), all rest upon this theory. We come to depend on certain people because we know they will act in a predictable and favorable manner. Similarly we avoid certain people, because they too will act in a predictable but unpleasant manner.

There is also a certain general agreement as to how habit is formed. A man credits his good qualities to the training he received from a mother or a father, or to the fact that his teachers were fortunately chosen. The succession of experiences from which he learned have combined to form the group of habits which have proven of value to him. These commonplaces are accepted when men are at all honest with themselves in thinking about the origin of their behaviors.

In the mind of the average man, there are other factors which enter: the man's own will, chance, and the way the individual has controlled his antecedent and formative influences. If he is a failure, he is sure that he was peculiarly unfortunate in the conditions under which his life was lived; if he is successful, he is equally sure that he has a peculiar quality which accounts for that success; or, if he is deeply religious, he will reverently believe that God has interfered in his behalf, to protect him from disaster and to make success possible. The religious believer, the egotist, the defeated, all join in believing that there is the interposition of some other factor than that of a natural and causal sequence of behaviors to account for the group of present behaviors and attitudes which together make up the personality of the individual.

Social case work, on the other hand, bases its explanation of behavior on the theory of the genetic relationship of behaviors to each other. It, of course, goes farther and looks to environmental factors, especially to social heritage, as the stimuli which are constantly calling out forms of behavior, and marking the limits within which they may function.

There are therefore occasional sharp differences of opinion between the social case worker and the representative of a church. Belief in divine intervention would logically lead a churchman to disregard or discount the patient findings of the case worker, and to urge a course of treatment based upon a con-

fidence that, now that the individual has indicated a reliance upon divine mercy, the past has lost its significance as an index of his future conduct. The case worker, however, believes that while this change of heart may indicate a hopeful new attitude, it in no way negates the theory of the genetic relationship of his past behavior to his future. The Roman Catholic churches in practice come closer to the theory of the social worker than the Protestant. Because of the periodic admissions made at confession, the promises made in worship are likely to be interpreted in the light of all that the man is, and not as if they stood on a basis cut off from all that went before. The social case worker rarely, if ever, has to struggle with a priest of that church to get him to accept a realistic view of any situation.

A serious difficulty growing out of this basic difference of theory is that the churchman is rarely trained in the matter of social evidence, and accepts at its face value the story or character as it appears at first in word or act. A family with a pitiful story can ordinarily persuade him, no matter how specious the tale. There are probably no harder people in our large American cities to win to any effective coöperation in case work than members of some of the rich churches and strongly religious fraternal bodies. The very same groups which support community funds, which believe—in the abstract—in the organization of social work because it appeals to them as the most efficient manner of

using the charitable resources of the community, become, in the concrete, veritable sentimentalists.

There are many aspects to this deplorable situation; but the chief one is that by adopting such a naïve, even gullible attitude, the churchman simply cuts himself off from any participation with or understanding of the strength of social case work. Until the churchman is willing to use the same judgment in appraising the evidence of those who apply for aid as he does with those who would sell him goods, he can never understand what social case work is all about. If, in addition to this boasted use of the "common sense" method of sizing up a person, he backs up his position by relying upon the authority of the church, and the citation of scriptural passages, more or less pertinent, he passes into the realms of the mystical and absolute into which the social worker cannot follow.

The extreme individualism also which has characterized the thinking of some of the church groups finds no response in the mind of the social case worker. To him an individual is to be understood only in terms of his personal associations. Personality is known only in relationships; so far as we know it could not exist by itself; and it has no solitary significance. To the social case worker, a good man is defined in terms of goodness in all his social relations. The only tests that are pertinent are the measurement of his value as a citizen, a father, a husband, a neighbor, a scholar, a friend, a church-

man. Is his contact in those relationships one which promotes the interests of the group; is the group improved by his association with it? And he will judge the "promotion" by looking closely upon what actually takes place, estimating whether it is in line with the function of that social institution or whether it is contrary to its nature. That is, as a father is he transferring to his children those heritages of the race which experience has demonstrated the new generation must possess if it is to meet successfully the responsibilities of adult life? Each of his social relationships throws a light upon his social value; but no abstract theory of democracy or of individual right or value can play much part in determining how far short he falls of meeting such a test, or in pointing the way by which he may do so more successfully in the future.

Should the church carry on social work? Probably in the end, unless the church wishes to become a social agency and abandon its religious function, it will turn the task of social work over to the specialized agencies.

The matter, however, is not quite so simple. Some of those in need of social case work are its own members. And, even more important, appeals for aid and motives for giving it are tied up closely in the religious heritage of the race. The present practice is for churches to take care of their own, and to leave others to the care of social agencies. But if there is any value in the method of social

case work, then those whom the church regards as "its own" should have the benefit of it, as well as those outside of churches. Two answers have been given to that challenge. The first is that churches should employ case workers to deal with the social case problems among their members, even that its ministers themselves should understand something of the technique of case work. The other is that the church in the person of its representative should be skilled to the point of recognizing the existence of social case problems, and know where the resources are which are available for their treatment.

There is another aspect of the question of whether the church should enter the field of social work which the possession of adequate skill cannot answer satisfactorily. It makes a difference under what auspices social case work is to be done, not because of social case work, but because of the clients served. It will be used only in those ways and for the promotion of those values which are appreciated by the agency doing it: school, church, or industry. Those human values which do not come within their scope are apt to be neglected. This is peculiarly true in social work under religious auspices. In fact, certain religious groups make no mystery of the matter but state definitely that they are in social work in order to attract or to hold people to their religious order: the Salvation Army and the missions for transient men, as well as many institutional churches. Apart from its questionable value

to organized religion, it is an unquestioned handicap to social work. Under such conditions, only so much of social work will be maintained as will draw or hold people to religious organization.

Perhaps the most puzzling aspects of this relationship between social case work and the church is the part the church may play in treatment. If a man is suspected of being sick, a physician is available; the social case worker knows what to ask, and what to do with the answer. The same with an employer or a school-teacher or a relative. These sources of information about the individual are fairly well known both by those whom the case worker calls a "source" and by the case worker himself. But where does the church function in human rebuilding? What shall the social worker ask the church to do? Whom in the church shall he ask? There is no doubt about the fact that religion plays an important part in the development of character. No one even superficially acquainted with sources of strength, of wholesomeness, and of beauty in human life can have a moment's question on that matter.

The case worker is facing, therefore, two problems at this point, and in both of them he must look to the church for their solution. In the first place he needs to know what are the symptoms by which the need for religious ministration may be recognized. Is the mere absence from church attendance or church connection the significant thing? What

are the symptoms in one's life by which absence of religious experience may be noted? To the social case worker, to whom all behavior, including religion, is to be explained as the most favorable response to environmental necessities, religion must be explained in terms of its social function. Perhaps the best definition for this purpose is: religion is that attitude of mind which enables the individual and the race most successfully to face the unknown and to meet the frustration of its hopes. It would seem that such an attitude is one of reverence toward those aspects of life which are not known, and of faith that somehow they work together for good. Therefore the absence of religion would be the failure to develop a reverential attitude, and the lack of any vital faith in the essential goodness of the universe. "To do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God," is a concise statement of such a definition of religious attitude, with at least one of its ethical results. As one translates that formula into case work terms he would be led to infer that there are at least two general classes of people known to case workers to whom that experience, or that attitude, has not become a reality: those who, beaten in the struggle of life, have given up in despair—the hopeless, "the leaden-eyed," for whom the processes of living have lost all significance; and in the second place those who in the face of their defeats have developed hostile and belligerent attitudes, to whom reverence and

humility in the face of their frustrations appear confessions of weakness.

In the second place, when the case worker turns to the church and asks for a service which may arouse these attitudes in the lives of his clients, he is met with the most indifferent success. This may be because he does not know what he wants himself. But then, he can ask with real pertinence, why should he know? the demand that he should know is made by no other treatment source. The physician makes no such demand; and the case worker is trained not to be specific in his requests of the physician. All the physician wishes to know of the case worker is that the client is not well. That the client has failed to secure the strength of the religious attitude should be all that the church should ask of the social worker; the church should then be equipped to take such a client and lead him back into the place where his previous failures to find a religious explanation of life may be corrected. The very description of the method which social case work expects is eloquent of the gap between the church and social case work. Church members have grown insensibly into their religious attitude; they take their religious experiences and exercises as part of their everyday lives, because religion has been built into their habit structure and is an important factor in their emotional life. Neither churchman nor church leader is conscious of a process of acquiring this religious attitude, of a process which can be taken out and seen

as a thing in itself, and applied to various sorts of people. Therefore, when a task such as that of creating a religious attitude in one who is irreligious is presented to the church, there is nothing in the experience of the average churchman to guide him in dealing with one who has failed to participate in any such development.

The actual response of the church to such appeal is usually disappointing. A questionnaire sent out to a group of churches on the subject of the relation of the church to social work in one of our large cities was in the first place ignored by most of the churches receiving it. But in response to the question, "In what manner may the church help the social agency in its effort to rehabilitate families?" some said they had no resources, some that they had a day nursery, some that they gave Christmas baskets, some that they had a relief fund which in certain cases could be used. The question was carefully worded to avoid that sort of a response; yet, in spite of the care, the churches saw in their contact with the disadvantaged only the opportunity to minister to the body. Not one saw that there was a religious service which alone was the distinctive contribution of the church.

This is probably the heart of the question of the relation between the church and social case agencies, whose task is the study and treatment of people who have failed in their social adjustments. The church has a unique contribution to make: it is the

awakening of the spiritual life in the persons of the clients known to social agencies. It is to discover a method by which spiritual attitudes may be created and to apply it to those who seem to be without them. It probably is also necessary to create a method by which the degree of religion may be determined, that the church may know just what one needs when he stands before it ready to receive its ministration. This project is in no way advanced when the church holds a basket of food in one hand for the hungry, or offers a choice of second-hand clothes to those who are naked. The social case worker is very apt to see the end of all hope of any spiritual ministration in such substitution of the physical for the spiritual.

Sooner or later the church will have to equip itself for the task of creating religious life in those who have no religion. To the case worker, the only hope of doing this is by a careful study of the conditions under which religion flourishes and by which it decays in the individual life, and then by an application of these careful studies of actual people to the task of creating it in those who have lost it, or have never had it. When that time comes, social agencies can use the church as a real source for social case treatment. And far better than any benefit which will come to social agency, or to church, or to their relations, when that time really comes, the individual man and woman and the families of which they are a part will receive treatment for

their spiritual impoverishment and failures just as they do now for the economic, physical, legal, mental, esthetic, and the other losses of their lives. In a very real sense, all these other aspects find their meanings not in themselves but in that sublimation of human frustrations and unsolved riddles which the human race has called its religion: its all-embracing philosophy of the meaning of life.

HEALTH

HAVEN EMERSON

PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Receiving the degree of doctor of medicine in 1899 from Columbia University, Dr. Emerson engaged in the practice of medicine, together with research work, for a number of years. In 1914 he was appointed commissioner of health in New York City, and continued in this office until, as a colonel in the Medical Corps, he went to France with the A.E.F. in 1918. His outstanding service as a member of the staff of the Chief Surgeon's Office brought him the high distinctions of the Médaille des Epidémies and being made an Officier de la Légion d'Honneur.

Returning to this country, Dr. Emerson became professor of preventive medicine at Cornell University. Since 1922 he has been a member of the faculty of Columbia University, as well as director of the De Lamar Institute of Public Health. The surveys which he has directed in eight of the leading cities of the country comprise a most valuable phase of his public health work since the war.

Dr. Emerson is an associate editor of *The Survey* and of *The Nation's Health.*

HEALTH

HAVEN EMERSON

The church is as essentially a community as any other assembly of individuals who are bound together by a common race, faith, purpose, or need, each of which may be best advanced by such association as permits easy opportunity for the expression of chosen leadership and an outlet for the members to share in common work for a more nearly Christian way of living.

Ignorance of the facts of life, of the relationships among the unity of living things, of the relentlessness of the biological necessity of survival, of the natural powers of resistance and repair, of the indiscriminate brutality of disease processes, of the strength and powerlessness of our human kind in contact with invisible and gross living and inanimate factors of health and disease, this lack of knowledge of ourselves, as accumulated assets and liabilities of generations, in relation to other forms of life, is probably the first and simplest cause of lack of health in any community.

Lack of understanding of the enduring, life-giv-

ing, life-saving, life-lengthening value of the principles of human relationships taught by all the great religious leaders of the ages is, if possible, an even greater actual present-day potentiality in the development of handicapped lives.

Mere facts of science unless understood and applied in a spirit of unselfishness serve but incompletely for our purpose.

The attainment of health, its security, its extension through all the years of human life, is a worthy goal for every community, as much in the common, as in the personal or individual interest of its members.

Ignoring for the moment the fact that a church community is in practically all circumstances in this country but a small fraction of the general county, village, or city unit of population, and in its turn consists of numerous sub-groups, the families and households drawn to the church by a common faith or devotion to a gifted pastor, let us think of the congregation as a self-contained unit and consider how, with its combined resources, it may effectively share in health work.

The training of the clergy does not yet include education in the fundamental sciences to the extent that they can assume the rôle of teachers of the causes and means of control of the preventable diseases, or so guide their flock in the laws of nutrition and growth and personal habits of body and mind that education in health will result.

The indispensable contribution of the ministers of religion to the sum of health is certain to be chiefly through their influence upon the quality of human relationships. Social justice, fair relations between employer and employee, the daily practice of the Golden Rule, the ethical value of self-control, self-denial, personal unselfishness, the undoubted aid of equanimity, and the cheerfulness of a sincere faith in the good nature of our fellows—it is among these influences for health that we may properly expect the church leadership to add, unconsciously perhaps, but none the less definitely, to the quality and quantity of health of their own community.

We have been through at least two major phases of health endeavor, and if one can gage the signs of the times with any certainty, we are at the threshold of another which has potentialities far beyond the accomplishments of its predecessors.

In this country, as abroad, wherever the people were reached by the facts and principles of modern science, there prevailed for about two hundred years a practice of health, dealing with communities, whether camps or prisons, cities or nations, based almost exclusively upon the authority of the State. Law enforcement, compulsory observance of sanitary codes and statutes, control of environment in the interest of public safety, were the slogans of health authorities. English and American practice as early as the end of the seventeenth century established the principle in law and civil administration

that the safety of the group, the community, was more important than the convenience or even the personal liberty of the individual. Property right, whether real or personal, possessions and the rights of occupancy of one's own premises and conduct of a business or trade, were sometimes abrogated in the interest of the safety of the lives of the people.

Isolation of the sick, quarantine of exposed and susceptible persons, condemnation of houses, destruction of infested clothing, confiscation of deteriorated foods, have all been accepted as suitable applications of health authority for the protection of communities against communicable diseases.

The health officer, for these purposes vested with the police power of the State, became commonly a sort of glorified sanitary patrolman, searching for nuisances, wielding the big stick, threatening the violator with penalties, and acting commonly as the only contact between the laboratory sciences in preventable disease and the public service. He was often a voice crying in the wilderness, alone in his community striving to raise the level of living into cleanliness. In spite of the hardness, even brutality, of much of the official health work from 1700 to 1900, there was accomplished a great and permanent improvement in sanitation typified by a safe disposal of human wastes, the protection and purification of water supplies, and the accumulation of convincing evidence of the communicability of many diseases known to be of bacterial or parasitic origin.

By the beginning of this century there came a consciousness, bred of the rapidly expanding knowledge of tuberculosis, that further progress in disease prevention awaited an understanding by the lay public of the origin and spread of infection. While there were States like Michigan where the teaching of the means of distribution of the communicable diseases was begun in the grade schools long before any concerted effort was made in the direction of popular health education, it was not until about 1900 that the imagination of public leaders in medicine and social practice was seized with the idea that all the people could be taught the three simple truths about tuberculosis, then the leading cause of death in this country. Tuberculosis is communicable, preventable, and curable. Once these facts were accepted from an authoritative source, a prompt demand for a plan of action for prevention developed.

For the past quarter-century official and volunteer agencies have swept the country with their several resourceful and largely effective campaigns of popular health information.

Following the leader, in time, power, and interest, the tuberculosis movement, there came the effort to prevent infant mortality, with its logical sequels, the campaigns for prevention of maternal mortality and the extension of infant welfare into the runabout age. Then the school-child began to reap the benefits of systematic hygiene at the hands of school

doctors and nurses. Not far behind came the crusades for reduction of the venereal diseases, for understanding of mental hygiene, for cancer control, for prevention of heart disease, and for the abatement of the causes leading to blindness and deafness.

With the firm establishment of permanent policies for the control of environment and general acceptance of the reasonableness of the application of authority under boards or commissioners of health, and the almost universal understanding of the nature and possibilities of preventing the more prevalent causes of sickness and death, we began to enter the present or third phase of health effort, that of personal participation in self-preservation.

Sanitation, Education, Participation; these may well be the titles of our three chapters of experience.

The development of the plan and services for the latest chapter came within the past few years and as the logical result of experience chiefly since 1900.

Briefly, the evidence was overwhelming that the starting-point of intelligent personal health effort was precise knowledge of the individual's condition as determined by a physician. At whatever age, appropriate planning of health habits depends not upon generalization, but on specific facts. We use the term "public health" to describe the state of life, and its safety, in the collectivity; but what we mean is the sum of individual healths, the safety of the

expectant mother, the feeding and care of the infant, the immunization and nutrition of the runabout child, each of these a separate particular problem calling for a fine discrimination based on personal examination and inquiry, often involving problems of heredity, social relationships, conduct, emotions, and mentality. We include in the term "public health" the detection of defects in children at school, their correction or prevention, the supervision of children in industry, the service to employed persons of all ages to permit of avoidance of occupational hazards, the supervision of the declining years when concessions and modifications of habits of work, play, food, and conduct in life are obligatory if we would save the grandparents for the happiness of the younger generations.

Sanitation and information alone will not meet our present ambition. There is needed the further aid of skilled professional direction of our lives by those who bring into the home, shop, kitchen, living-room, playground, and nursery the facts of the sciences of life so interpreted for each of us according to our age, sex, race, occupation, and personality, that we may serve best whatever great purpose we were born for.

By whatever name, periodic or health examination, the indispensable element in our modern conception of a complete health program is the relationship between the apparently healthy person at all ages and a physician by which he seeks to guide

his patient around rather than through disease. This is the true preventive medicine of to-day and the future.

From this review of the situation it must appear that the church's function in that part of social work which is health work cannot properly be that of a health service station, but rather that of an influence upon the conduct of life and human relationships, and a source of information and inspiration through which the members of its community can attain by their own initiative and conscious effort the best health they are capable of.

Certain services, such as protection of water and food supplies, laboratory examinations of sputum and throat cultures, hospitalization of the infected, recording the incidence and distribution of sickness and death, must be provided through officers of the civil government.

The church can and frequently does give loyal service by providing the pulpit and forum where public opinion is formed in favor of trained officers of health and a liberal policy by the local government toward the health department.

A church not infrequently has a group or committee on public relations. Such persons could, with advantage, measure the performance, equipment, and policies of the local health department on the basis of such an appraisal form as has been accepted widely throughout this country and issued by the American Public Health Association. Such a church

group could, with advantage, inform itself of the extent and character of preventable ill health and loss of life in its parish and analyze the contributory factors with a view to common action for their correction. As about seventy-five per cent of the dependency in our industrial cities is the result of illness, and much of the burden of this in money and human effort falls upon the church and its members, there is every reason for the church through its own or other sources to learn the handicaps which bring about unnecessary and impoverishing disease.

A project of study in a particular field of preventive medicine would quickly result in good self-education of a church health committee. Perhaps the urgent problems in the locality are a high infant mortality, much venereal disease and excessive delinquency among the youth, alcoholism, tuberculosis, or a prevalence of occupational disease, like that which develops in a dusty trade such as marble work or granite cutting.

There are furthermore many types of health service which can best be provided by individual or group initiative as distinct from those included under the public services, and the church may well serve as their point of origin.

The church health committee might secure information as to the extent to which the members of the parish or congregation are availing themselves of specific protective resources. Are all the adults vaccinated against smallpox? Have all the

babies been immunized against diphtheria before they were nine months of age? Have all the children of the church families received their toxin-antitoxin treatment? If there are travelers into foreign lands, Italy, France, Spain, or our own Southern States, are they vaccinated against typhoid fever before they start? Have all the members of a family where there is a case of tuberculosis had a thorough medical examination to exclude the possibility of an overlooked case of infection in others of the same household?

Any such series of inquiries if entered into with the discretion which social workers and physicians have learned to observe in matters of intimate personal concern would surely lead to plans for action.

Where can the expectant mothers obtain that type of medical and nursing supervision during pregnancy for the lack of which this country suffers in maternal and early infant deaths so far beyond the European nations? Are healthy-baby consultations and pre-school health classes and periodic medical examinations available and, on a self-respecting, self-supporting basis, within the means of the families and under the best professional auspices?

Has the unfortunate unmarried mother, found to have been infected with syphilis, been brought under sympathetic care for her cure? Have those with hookworm and malarial infections been guided so that they may be released from the physical, mental,

and spiritual depression accompanying chronic anemia and invalidism?

Do men and women alike know the possibilities of early recognition and surgical cure of some types of cancer? Does the church community still think of mental ill health as merely a kind word for insanity, or do they know that a sick mind, disordered emotions, strange forms of conduct, are no more mysterious or dangerous to others than many of the sicknesses of stomach, lung, and liver?

Is it possible that they have not learned how many a cardiac cripple has been salvaged for useful, happy self-support by being taught the limits of what he can do instead of being frightened into complete idleness?

One might picture a multitude of types of information which any eager interested group of people would wish to have in the field of health and preventive medicine. What shall the church do about it? Set up a health center, run a baby clinic, have a class in pre-school health, or engage a visiting nurse?

Let us agree that a church should not engage in the operation of any health service unless there is no other possible way in that community to arrange for the work under more appropriate professional auspices. Public health departments, private health associations, are so generally well prepared to undertake essential health functions, and are on the whole so wisely guided by persons trained in the various

professions involved in public health work, that the entrance of a church group into this field is quite likely to bring confusion, duplication, and a less well-trained personnel into the field.

Just as the churches do well to have the major part of their relief and family relations problems handled by the welfare agencies of the community, and the sick who ask their aid cared for by hospital and dispensary, so the decidedly technical professional work in health development and protection should be done through existing health organizations which will provide a type of responsible direction not as easily assembled under other auspices.

It is in every way better to aid in the support of a local nursing service, to assist with an extra worker at the cardiac clinic, to help the family welfare society to support a psychiatric social worker than to indulge in that kind of denominational proprietorship in a nurse or parish health station, which often appeals to loyal church members through their hearts rather than through their heads.

There are two forms of contribution to health which come with especial power from the church. The first is teaching by precept and example, by readings and interpretations of Old and New Testaments, and by reference to the works of devoted followers of Jesus, the bearing of our faith, of a life of Christian tolerance, or devoted unselfishness and courage, upon mental and spiritual health.

Also the church can avail itself of its organization, its meeting-place of kindred souls, its loyalty to a common aim in life, to provide education or information in health under the best possible auspices.

Individual and community health depends upon our understanding and use of the really quite simple and easily described natural laws which govern and guard that most adaptable but variable of animals, our fellow-man, his wife and child. Added to this must be the technical public and private services of professionally trained men and women.

Great progress has been made in giving security to life. We have since Lincoln's time approached two thirds of the way toward the biblical ideal of a life span of seventy years, and by the end of the century we may have attained that goal.

Length of years without better quality of life will be but a doubtful human asset. Figures, whether death rates, sick reports, or lives expressed in dollars, will never impress intelligent people so deeply as will personal experience with the practical results of life-saving among their friends. This can come only by observation and following the leadership of the physicians.

Much preventable sickness is of social origin, being a by-product of errors in our ways of congregate existence and the organizations of our production processes. The pastor or priest of a church can advance greatly the happiness of his people by

bringing to them in his pulpit or at their firesides the truths he gleans from those fellow-practitioners of the flock, the doctor, nurse, and social worker, the family physician most of all.

The church is one of the earliest symbols of the desire of families to join in a common project of faith and expression of their sense of the beauty of spiritual life. Without losing these precious motives which bind the members of the flock, there can be developed a true respect and admiration for the perfect human body, for all its functions, for its uses at its different ages.

The church cannot wisely become a health selling and promoting agency. The better it does its own indispensable work the more certainly will it make its largest contribution to the safety and fullness of life. The church can better be guided in every contemplated or determined move, whether for health education or health service, by those who have been trained for this special form of work. Ask the health officer, the physicians of the county medical society, the nurses, the medical social workers, the hospital and health agency executives, for their advice before entering the field of health service.

If it is found on mature consideration that there are serious gaps in a reasonably adequate community program for health, and that no existing official or volunteer health agency has the means or initiative or facilities for inaugurating the desired service, then it may be a proper public function of the church

to enter the field, with the approval of the health officer and of the organized medical profession.

The pastor, minister, or priest of any church community or parish, entirely apart from his place as spiritual consultant, confessor, and source of inspiration to his congregation, in itself a true and valuable contribution to health of mind and body, must nowadays be well informed as to the possibilities of protection to life, inherent in a consistent and well-proportioned program of services as conceived and widely put into effect by professional sanitarians through official and voluntary health agencies.

He must furthermore realize that, in addition to the formal organized work of public departments and private associations, the primary source of health education is the family doctor and his colleague and assistant, the visiting nurse.

SOCIAL HYGIENE

THOMAS W. GALLOWAY

Associate Educational Director, American Social Hygiene Association

Dr. Galloway brings to the field of sex education the weight of his years as biologist, lecturer, college professor, and dean. His pioneering has done much to bring about the new trend in sex education away from mere hygiene to an appreciation of the finest in sex relationships, and a training for it.

Born in Tennessee in 1866, he graduated from Cumberland University in 1887 and took an A.M. there in 1889 and a Ph.D. in 1892. His teaching career includes thirty-two years of service in Baird College, Missouri Valley College, James Milliken University, and Beloit College. His students have constantly been inspired to the broader aspects of biology in its relation to human life. During these years his pen was always busy, translating his laboratory findings for scientific periodicals and editing the *Quarterly Transactions* of the American Microscopic Society. He also found time for such a versatile range of production as text-books in zoology, *The Religion of an Evolutionist, Motivation in Moral Education, The Dramatic Instinct in Religious Education,* and an extensive list of books in the field of sex education, as well as a great variety of magazine articles.

In all his writings Dr. Galloway has held that sex is a normal factor in human life, that the same sound principles of education apply to it as to any other human factor, and that, wisely guided, it may richly endow individual expression. More than any other writer, he has contributed to the analysis of the principles and methods of education in social hygiene.

SOCIAL HYGIENE

THOMAS W. GALLOWAY

Social hygiene, at its widest, is a very inclusive term. It would properly cover all aspects of health —physical, emotional, intellectual—which bear on the welfare of society and its institutions. As limited by American usage, however, the term is restricted to the wholesome or unwholesome condition and uses of the two great functions which lie at the basis of human society and its perpetuation, the functions of reproduction and sex.

To the average person, because of false education, these terms carry first of all connotations of misuse, vulgarity, and perversion. As a matter of fact, this thought of them is both unworthy and unmerited. Organically and intrinsically these functions are less selfish, less competitive, more social, both in results and in spirit, than any other of our necessary functions. For example, the taking of food and the resulting nutritive processes are solely self-centered. We cannot eat for any one else. We cannot make it other than selfish. The best we can do is to eat inoffensively to others. In reality it is

around the getting of food and the various other self-serving functions that all of our most competitive and inhumane traits are developed and often gratified at the expense of weaker individuals. These functions standing alone never gave origin to attraction, unselfishness, consideration, service, sacrifice, love, and devotion for other members of the species. They never gave rise to a society nor to a social spirit. On the other hand, the loves of mates and of parents for children are just the emotional and social traits which sex and reproduction and care of young have produced both in men and the higher animals. Reproduction is never for the preservation of the parent. It is always at the expense of the parent. It preserves the species. Sex makes reproduction more effective. Reproduction and sex are justly the ground for pride rather than shame. They are the distinctly "social" functions. That they shall be wholesomely and effectively used *is* "social hygiene."

Without extended argument we may then sum up the normal and constructive function of social hygiene thus: so to live our family lives, and so to interpret these to the young from the beginning of life, both inside the home and out, that young persons shall build the habits, character, disposition, and knowledge which shall enable them in their turn, to establish still more beautiful and impressive families of their own. *In a word, the goal of normal social hygiene is the conservation and improvement of the human family, and to secure the richest, most*

permanent personal happiness and social development.

Naturally there are pathological aspects and misuses of these great urges and functions. We may bring our unsocial self-indulgent attitude into the sex and reproductive relations. It is this that motivates the abuses. The impulses and appetites connected with our various functions are strong in proportion to the value and importance of the function. Our temptation to overindulgence is in proportion to the strength of the impulse. Among, and arising from, these abuses of the sex and reproductive functions are: masturbation, promiscuity, prostitution, the venereal diseases, illegitimacy, marital unfaithfulness, broken homes, parental exploitation and miseducation of children, and repudiation by children of their obligations within the home. These pathological conditions must be met; but they do not constitute the most important problems of social hygiene. The thing perverted is more important than the perversion; and our great task is a constructive one.

It is obvious from what has been said that the task of introducing our children and young people to the issues of sex and reproduction is the problem of the whole community. From the very beginning of life our children are endowed with their sex qualities. As these unfold they profoundly mold and stimulate the whole physical development, the satisfactions, the personal and social attitudes, and the

behavior of young people. We gain nothing by ignoring the normal power of sex in the life of the individual.

From the very beginning too the developing child is surrounded by a complex social environment, which is builded upon sex itself and is strenuously, artificially, consciously, and often perversely sexed. The very family into which he is born is brought together and organized primarily under the impulses of sex and reproduction. The environment both attracts the child and furnishes it many practical and definite problems.

To expect the sexed child to react soundly to this sex-saturated environment without aid is unreasonable. To enable it to do so requires that every person and agency which strongly influences the child's development shall help it understand and respond effectively to both its internal and its external sex stimuli.

In the light of the elements in this situation it is inevitable that the church must assume high interest and responsibility in the field of sex-character education. Nothing is more vital to the church and its future than that the human family should maintain itself and be improved. There is no field of human interest in which the church can more appropriately express its genius. Jesus himself indicated that among his followers the rule of life and progress should be that greatness depends upon the completeness of ministry, that each should serve all in pro-

portion to strength. We know no place in the whole of human society where this is so nearly and normally realized as in the perfect family. To be sure, the church has always been interested in family life and has variously approached the problem of its improvement. It is not unfair, however, to say that this effort at service has often been thoroughly unscientific. The time has come when science may render specific aid to the church in this, one of its most distinctive tasks.

In the first place, in fostering social hygiene the church should furnish both inspiration and coöperation to the other agencies in the community. It must give to the community, through coöperation with them, a demonstration of the Master's doctrine of service. For example, the church may well support any sane effort in the schools to handle, both in the curriculum and in the social life of the school, sex information and guidance suitable to the age of the children. It may appropriately foster the work of the Parent-Teacher Associations, as these study for the welfare and character-development of children. It should aid the physicians in their effort to eliminate the venereal diseases. It should encourage the civil authorities to pass and enforce wholesome measures for the elimination of prostitution and other perverse expressions of sex. It should encourage all protective and preventive measures, whose purpose is to make it impossible for any one to exploit for sexual purposes the immature, the

mentally deficient, and those who are, economically or otherwise, at a disadvantage in life.

In addition to this, the more distinctive part of the church in the work of social hygiene is to apply in all its appropriate training activities the Christian spirit in a scientific manner. This means that the great work of the church in social hygiene is sex education. In such education good-will is not enough. We must *know* the facts and must be able to impart this information to the young at such times and in such manner as will win their enthusiastic assent. It means habit formation, the habit of fine rather than cheap feeling, living, and thinking; and such habit formation is not a casual matter. To do such work requires that the teacher shall know the laws by which habits and attitudes are formed. The church has always been interested in developing character. It has not always worked scientifically in practice. No one of our impulses calls for more intelligent planning and guidance than this of sex.[1]

We cannot expect the average church to go much beyond the leadership which the minister furnishes. This is peculiarly true in connections as nice and delicate as these of sex inspiration and training. If, therefore, the church is to bring adequate sex guidance to its own young people, the minister must furnish the leadership and must build up around himself a group of liberal and open-minded members who will support him in this work. His first obligation

[1] See Gruenberg, *Parents and Sex Education.*

then is to prepare himself wisely to lead those in his congregation who are most ready to follow, and who in turn can most effectively lead others. All the specific tasks suggested below, as a part of the privilege of the church, must be thought of and approached in the light of this fact of the minister's necessary preparation.

The minister who believes that the church should express itself in the social hygiene work of its community must be alert to all public movements for social hygiene within the community. He must be ready to interpret the value of such a community movement to his own membership, and no less to stamp upon the movement the idealism and spiritual attitudes of the church itself.

It is peculiarly the minister's task to aid individuals in his own congregation, and among its friends, in solving their own problems of sex and reproduction. There are a few of these individual needs so outstanding as to call for special mention.

1. The minister is often in a peculiarly happy position to aid married people who are making some failure in their marital relations. If he is wise and observant, he can often discover these before they have gone far enough to produce wreckage. With tact he may be able, especially if the people are still young and open-minded, to help them correct the difficulties, which are ordinarily due to lack of preparation for and understanding of marriage itself.

2. Parents, particularly those who have not been

trained in mental and social hygiene and the psychology of childhood, frequently make serious mistakes in the early discipline of their children. With the very best intention they may, through overstrict treatment, alienate their children. Or, on the other hand, they may by indulgence render the children so dependent upon their parents as to threaten a serious weakening of the personality. Unconsciously they may also produce unfortunate sex complexes in their children. The efficient minister needs to be scientifically prepared to see, and to help meet, the more common errors in parental treatment of children.

3. We allow young people to blunder into marriage with only the aid which they can gain furtively or which comes to them by chance. There is no issue in life which so conditions happiness and usefulness as the quality of marriage. Young people should know, well ahead of time, some very definite things about the selection of mates, the necessity of mutual adjustments, and the methods of making such adjustments, as well as about the care of children. We are greatly at fault if we do not give them this guidance in ways which will win their utmost confidence in both our love and our wisdom. The minister in charge owes it to himself and to his young people to establish such a bond of confidence that he can bring to them something of this aid.

Such opportunities are almost unlimited. The alert minister can scarcely render greater service to

adults than to recognize these problems and to help his people solve them in a practical and effective manner.

The minister has a remarkable opportunity in his pulpit for social teaching and for propaganda of the right sort in relation to many of these social hygiene problems. His opportunities are not limited at all to an occasional sermon against divorce. Indeed it is much more important that he should continually be making clear what practical religion means: in the family with all its multiform relationships of husband and wife, mother and daughter, mother and son, father and son, father and daughter, brother and sister; in strengthening the spirit of mutual coöperation which must obtain within the family; in discovering the ways by which this cooperation may be fostered; in developing a proper balance between dependence upon the parents and the gradual self-dependence which must come to the children; and in determining the relation of the family and its spirit to society at large.

Perhaps the most important aspects of the minister's leadership within the church connect with the formal educational agencies of the church, such as the Sunday-school and the various organizations for the training of young people. Possibly the greatest weakness in the educational work of the church has been its too great dependence upon what we may call *deductive* pedagogy. This means that we elders lay down a broad and abstract principle of

life and imagine that we can persuade the young people to accept this principle and to deduce from it a satisfying program for solving their particular problems. More and more, science is showing us that the way of youthful learning is *inductive*. The guidance we give to children should start with particular conduct suitably interpreted and rewarded, leading to comfortable and acceptable habits. By way of this kind of experience we gradually build up socially appropriate tastes, attitudes, and principles of life. This is just as true of sex as it is of anything else, and it means that we cannot wait until our young people are adolescent, and then by general instruction and preaching about sex bring to them that mastery and understanding of their own sex nature which will enable them to discover by way of these marvelous impulses the greatest happiness and fineness and usefulness which can come to us as human beings. They must on the contrary be aided to build sound habits of acting, feeling, and thinking about sex from earliest life. The Sunday-school offers, perhaps, the most happy prospect for church usefulness in sex education. It can begin with the parents of the children in the cradle roll, and it can take the youngest class of beginners and help them to appreciate the meaning of their own homes and fathers and mothers; it can pass on, by way of adolescents, to those young people who themselves are contemplating marriage and can begin to fit them for a new and wiser adventure in parenthood.

The above statement is of sufficient importance to warrant some definite suggestions as to what a well equipped Sunday-school might hope to do. There is not one of the classes suggested below which, with a little forethought and preparation, could not be effectively provided in a convinced and enterprising church. Perhaps the order in which they could be undertaken by the average Sunday-school is about as indicated. Nevertheless this order should be determined by local needs and preparedness. These courses should not be didactic. They should not consist of lectures. They should be very intimate study-discussion courses. The various courses will not need to be given continuously, but may be offered from time to time as called for. Those promising the best in enabling the church and its families most adequately to meet the problems growing out of sex and reproduction are:

1. *Course for parents of young children.*[1]—In this course would be discussed the sex problems and questions of young children, the responsibility of parents for meeting these situations frankly, and something of the methods whereby this may be done. It is possible to do this in such a way as greatly to strengthen the bonds between the parents and the children.

[1] Such a course is now being published by the Book Concern of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the use of the associated denominations.

2. *Course for parents of adolescent children.*—Many parents who succeed reasonably well with young children become almost complete failures as their children pass into adolescence. Perhaps there is no point in parent-child relationships where parents are so ignorant and helpless. Parents must come to know what is necessary to enable them to furnish leadership for older children, and the technique of doing it.

3. *Course for the training of teachers.*—This is an obvious necessity. If the courses mentioned below are to be given, the Sunday-school undertaking this type of work must inspire and help every exceptionally suitable person to prepare himself or herself for some one of the specific types of work called for in the sex education of young people. The teacher-training course must, therefore, be comprehensive and very fundamental.

4. *Course for young men of marriageable age.* Many young men come to face the problem of marriage with all the misinformation and fallacies of their boyhood clinging to them. There is much about themselves which they need to know, not as fantastic guesses but with scientific accuracy. They need similarly to know the essential physical and emotional facts about the other sex. All this is necessary, if love, courtship, marriage, and the mutual adjustment essential for happy marriage are to be met and used wisely. There is perhaps nothing

that the church can do which is of greater value for the future generation than to present adequately this course and the next.

5. *Course for young women of marriageable age.* The purposes and methods of this course are entirely comparable with the preceding. Naturally all allowance must be made for both the natural and cultural differences between the sexes.

6 *and* 7. *Courses for high school boys and high school girls.*—Space will not allow even an outline of these two courses. It is clear enough that the junior and senior high school periods, including as they do puberty and middle adolescence, are really critical times in the sex life of boys and girls. Surely the church is responsible for making some nicely appropriate contribution to the philosophy of life and of conduct, which is rapidly crystallizing during this stage of development. Equally surely the teachers of young people of these ages should have the personality and the knowledge to make appealing the best in sex, and to set up rational, prudential, esthetic, and ethical inhibitions against the worst.

8. *Course for adults in relation to the vital sex-social community conditions and needs.*—Such a course as this, given occasionally to the active wide-awake adults in a church, ought to stimulate a sense of the responsibility and opportunity which the church has, and a knowledge of the methods being developed to remove those environmental conditions which threaten the sex life of our young people, and

to strengthen those influences which give them a chance to make the most of their sex endowment.

If any minister or layman has read this chapter and has concluded that his church should assume something of the task, the first steps toward the realization of this idea would be: that the minister and one or two sane, influential, and effective men and women examine the field and carefully prepare themselves for leadership; that the minister or this small group working together undertake the guidance of a study-discussion course for other adults. This first adult course might be either an experimental class for parents of growing children, or a small teacher-training class to prepare definitely picked leaders, each one chosen specifically because of fitness to lead some study seen to be needed in the congregation.

It is not necessary at the beginning to take the whole congregation, much less the whole community, into one's confidence in regard to the project. Until the matter is well in hand and well understood by those who are to be responsible, publicity may be a definite disadvantage. Such publicity should not be undertaken until there is a little group of effective people who are convinced of the possibilities of this sort of work and can properly interpret it to the congregation. Not until adults are convinced and prepared should any effort be made to introduce sex-educational material for children and young people. Then should follow a period of very sane and intel-

ligent popular education for the purpose of creating sentiment in favor of constructive experimentation.

This statement with regard to the necessity of sex education does not, as a matter of fact, add work to the already overloaded clergyman. The minister inevitably meets these problems of sex at every turn in his work. The purpose of this essay is to give him some aid in meeting more effectively and more readily difficulties which he cannot escape. In spite of this, probably only far-seeing and energetic ministers would undertake in mid-career to develop this seemingly new enterprise, because of the technical difficulties it presents. For this reason it would seem the duty of theological seminaries, either in connection with courses already offered or in new courses, to furnish at least the essential instruction needed to fit the minister to incorporate in his church work this highly urgent phase of character education. None other of our native impulses so influences for good or ill the ethical, moral, and religious attitudes. The sex impulses cannot be ignored safely. They should be met squarely, constructively, and intelligently by religious teachers.

It is the business of the American Social Hygiene Association to collect scientific data in regard to sex-character education. It has built up a considerable library of books and pamphlets dealing with these facts and with the methods of using them pedagogically. To be sure, these materials are not infallible nor final, but they are the best of which we know at

the present. The association regards it as both a duty and a pleasure to coöperate in every possible way with any of the community agencies wishing to render service to their young people. The staff of the association stands ready also to aid—by answering questions or giving advice—the theological seminaries, denominational boards, or individual churches. It prepares or advises in the preparation of literature bearing upon various aspects of the subject and for different age groups. It now has in preparation a series of lessons for parents, suitable for use in Sunday-school. This association cordially offers its utmost services and invites coöperation in any aspect of this program.

MENTAL HYGIENE

HARRISON S. ELLIOTT

Professor of Practical Theology, Union Theological Seminary

The contributions of Professor Elliott to the work and progress of Christian organizations have been varied and unusual. Perhaps the most notable phase of his service has been in his relation to the Y.M.C.A. Even before his graduation from Drew Theological Seminary in 1911 he became secretary of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations. Devoting special attention to Bible study, he developed the principles and effective methods of group study, resulting in the publication of a series of books known as the *College Voluntary Study Courses.* Later he served also as secretary of other departments in the Y.M.C.A., as well as becoming editor of the Association Press. An outstanding activity has been the training of leaders for work with young people and adults and developing materials for their use. He has also become widely known through his work at student and other conferences.

An early and valuable experience of Mr. Elliott's was as secretary to Bishop Bashford, who was in charge of Methodist Episcopal Missions in China. This post took the secretary, recently graduated from college, twice around the world, spending a year in China on each trip.

His interest in education has led him to complete his work for a doctor's degree in Teachers College of Columbia University. He is recognized particularly for his strong espousal of the democratic principle in religious education.

For the past five years Professor Elliott has been a member of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, where he is director of the Department of Religious Education and Psychology. Among his writings are *The Why and How of Group Discussion,* and several very successful study courses, the most notable of which is *How Jesus Met Life Questions.*

MENTAL HYGIENE

HARRISON S. ELLIOTT

An understanding of mental hygiene has the same importance in the church as in any other institution. This is the most obvious answer to the question, but it may at the same time be the most fundamental. The child who comes to a church school, or the adult who engages in the activities of a church, brings with him the patterns which influence his conduct in all the other relationships of life. He assumes toward those in posts of responsibility in the church similar attitudes to those which characterize his conduct toward persons in the same types of responsibility in home, school, social, or community life.

The mental hygiene point of view is also essential to the understanding of the religious experience of the individual, and therefore to a sound religious education in connection with the church. Any one who has not made careful observations in this realm will be surprised at the extent to which an individual's type of religion, whether that individual be a child or an adult, is correlated with

his personality needs and characteristics. In the lives of children or adults who accept religion as a valid part of their experience, it does not represent something apart but the supreme answer to their needs and the most potent source of help. If the individual is very dependent, if he lacks security in the relationships of life, he will want a type of church, a form of worship, and a conception of God which will take care of him, and which will offer him a supreme source of security. If he is a person of a more independent type, he will be repelled and may say that religion is unnecessary in his life. The reason for this will probably be that he has not found religion offered to him on a more mature and adult level. If he wants religion as an escape, it is because this is the most consistent pattern of his life. If he uses it as a resource in the midst of life's activities, it is because he has learned how to employ the other resources of life on a cooperative basis.

The church worker with children or adults who does not understand these personality needs and characteristics may unwittingly use religion to accentuate undesirable patterns. On the other hand, if the minister or other church worker has mental hygiene insight and understanding, the church may be a very important factor in securing a progressively free personality. As a matter of fact, the church is a particularly potent influence, because for adults who turn to the church for help, and for children

of religious parents, religion holds a place of authority and sanctity which reduces resistance to the minimum and gives to it a particularly powerful control.

The religious worker may not appraise correctly and use constructively the situations which arise in the actual conduct of religious education unless he has some understanding of personality problems and needs. A boy in a Sunday-school was given a principal part in a Thanksgiving pageant. After the pageant was completed, and when the children were talking it over, in reply to a question as to what they liked best, he said, "I liked myself best." On the surface, this seemed a very selfish and self-centered reply and would probably have been reproved by many a religious teacher. As a matter of fact, this was a very insecure boy who, in relation to other boys, felt a very definite sense of inferiority. He was given the part with the hope that he would discover that he had possibilities, and his reply was probably evidence of a constructive result.

A girl of ten said she would rather not go on an automobile drive because she must not miss her Sunday-school class. She shows in various ways deep religious zeal. Is this an evidence of her real interest, or is it something else? It happens that she is an adopted child whose mother died recently and who in various ways is seeking to "stand in well" with her foster parents. They are exceptionally religious people and show their great satisfaction at these

evidences of religious interest. At least, in appraising her conduct and knowing how to deal with it constructively, her teacher would have to take into account the possible sources of her religious zeal.

Another individual gives herself untiringly to church activities, and is exceptionally faithful. Is it because she has genuine interest in religion itself, or is it because the church activities give her a chance to occupy the center of the stage, or is it because without realizing it she loves the minister and has to please him? Possibly all three things are factors, but the minister will be able to carry on his relationship with this woman constructively only if he recognizes the possible causal factors in her conduct.

The Sunday-school teacher, the minister or other person in religious leadership will cause difficulty to himself and to those with whom he works unless he recognizes how far the attitudes taken toward him are taken not to him personally but to him in a representative capacity. Because of the place of the church and the minister in the emotional life of parishioners, the transference to him is stronger and more easily made than to a public school teacher or a psychiatrist. Further, because of the standing of the minister, people have less fear and self-consciousness in regard to their feelings toward him. This makes all the more necessary a degree of objectivity on his part which enables him to combine sympathetic understanding with an impersonal at-

titude. One parishioner praises him for his sermon and hangs on his words; another opposes everything he does and criticizes him to the other members of the congregation. He should not be unduly elated by the first or unduly disturbed by the second. As a matter of fact, a parishioner may praise him one day with extreme emotion and attack him the next. If he does not understand mental hygiene he will, as many ministers are doing, have his congregation divided into those who strongly support him and those who with equal earnestness oppose him, and he will himself suffer emotionally far more than is appropriate and necessary.

The Christian religion is concerned not only with overt action but also with the motives which impel action and the purposes which cause it. A study of mental hygiene makes us realize that with a superficial view of human behavior we may be deceived in regard to the reasons which cause conduct. It is only as we search in the experience of the individual for the real causal factors and consider the immediate behavior as symptomatic that we shall be able to deal constructively with a main concern of religion; namely, the motives which are operative and the purposes which form the dynamic of living.

The mental hygiene point of view is perhaps even more important in helping individuals develop a constructive type of religious experience. Without it teachers may accept as desirable unhealthy types of religious attitude and condemn as wicked

behavior which might form the basis of a more mature type of religion. A very dependent little child was afraid in a thunder-storm. Her mother said that she was powerless to help her and asked her why she did not apply some of her Sunday-school teachings. After a few minutes, the child said, "Mother, you may go." The next morning the child remarked: "Mother, I thought about what you said. After a while I felt a soft hand slipped into mine. I wasn't afraid. I went to sleep." In the discussion of the flood story, when the question was raised whether God really is like the God there depicted, and would punish in that way, one child replied, "Oh, yes, if they were really bad, He would." Another seemed to agree fully, as he remarked that his father punished him even when he didn't do anything bad.

Dr. Thaddeus Ames tells of the boy in his teens in the Protestant Episcopal Church who had defied his father, his teacher, and every person in authority over him. Finally one day he went to the altar in the church, threw his hat at it, and said, "There, God, what are you going to do about that?"

It is very evident that the religious teacher who does not understand personality problems and needs would not know how constructively to deal with these three incidents. He would probably consider the little girl who felt the presence of God in the thunder-storm as showing evidence of a most

desirable religious life and the boy who threw his hat at the altar as being a wicked youth. And in both cases he would be in danger of dealing with the situation without a real understanding of the reasons for the conduct and the significance it had in the life of the individual.

We all know many dependent or insecure individuals greatly in need of comfort and assurance, for whom religion and the institution of religion becomes a supreme and all-understanding home-and-mother substitute on an infantile level. We know many others who are lonely and without the appropriate love satisfactions of life who turn to the religious institution for the answer to these needs. The religious exercises for children, as well as the hymns, the ritual, and the messages of the minister for adults, are filled with evidences of efforts to satisfy these desires.

But without an understanding of the processes of personality development, ministers frequently adopt one or two courses of action, either of which seems harmful to the individual concerned. Just as many a mother cannot resist the satisfaction which is brought by the complete dependence of her child upon her and his unquestioning surrender to her approvals and disapprovals, so many a minister accepts the absolute dependence of the members of his congregation upon God because it seems the supreme evidence of the power of religion; and he plays upon it because it seems to increase the

control of religion and the importance of the church. But by so doing he is in the name of religion accentuating the individual's absolute dependence and developing or continuing an infantile type of religious experience. Other ministers, unwilling to have their religion take this sort of control over life, try to secure a more adult attitude by throwing the members of the congregation upon their own and insisting that God helps those who help themselves. This type of attitude frightens dependent individuals, and they leave their churches to search for a more secure haven. The understanding minister or other religious worker will seek to meet the needs of individuals at the stage of maturity they have attained. But he will deal with their dependence positively, so that each experience is progressively leading individuals in their religious life to the adult experience of comradeship with God, providing in the process what may be necessary for them of the complete dependent type of worship. He will be employing this help on so positive a basis that increasingly worship and prayer will represent that coöperative and mutual relationship with the divine resources which is the goal of the most dynamic religious experience.

From this it must be clear that the minister who understands mental hygiene will expect to find few difficulties exclusively in the realm of religion. Many individuals will come, saying that the source of their trouble is doubt, but if religion really does

represent for an individual the answer to his needs, then a religious difficulty is bound to be related to the personality needs. If religion is important in his life, it would be surprising if symptoms did not appear in the religious realm and if religious readjustment was not an essential part of his total adjustment. Dr. Fosdick said in a class in Union Theological Seminary on Work with Individuals that of his many interviews—for he makes this a major item in his ministry and is in direct coöperation with a psychiatrist to whom he sends his psychiatric cases—he finds a small minority that are matters of philosophic religious doubt. Frequently individuals come saying that they have lost their faith because of intellectual difficulties, but usually he finds these are but the focus of some personality problem, and he is unable to deal with the religious difficulty except as he helps on the personality adjustment. Of many examples he gave the following:

A girl came to him saying she had lost faith in God and that she was without hope in the world. After she had talked for a few minutes, he said, "Tell me about your love-affair." She wanted to know how he knew that was the difficulty, and then poured out her story, which showed that she had lost hope in the world and therefore felt that she had lost faith in God.

In an article in *Religious Education* for August, 1926, on "Doubts of College Students—Symptoms

or Causes?" Grace Loucks of the National Council of the Y.W.C.A., reports from her conference experience, in which many hundred college girls are involved, the following:

> When a girl has come saying she has lost or cannot find God, she may insist upon discussing fatalism or determinism or how God can be all-loving and all-powerful. In almost every instance the difficulty has been disillusionment or lack of legitimate security and satisfaction in some fundamental relationship of her life. Her real question is often: Is there a God if this (failure in a job, disappointment with parents or friends, or loss of a lover) can happen to me? Help has come not through philosophical analysis of the nature of the universe or its first cause, but in helping her find the way to the adjustment of those particular relationships that make possible a new experience of trust or confidence. Wherever this has happened the result has been a certainty and conviction that often is unshakable. . . . A girl who boasted of her lack of belief in any of the doctrines which her family or church held, admitted that her attitude represented not so much her considered judgment on the issues in question as her revolt against the restraints and coercion of too anxious parents.

Is it not evident that the successful solution of religious difficulties is dependent upon an understanding of the personality problems involved?

In considering the failures and inadequacies of human folk, the mental hygiene point of view is particularly important on the question of sin. Religious workers have tended to carry over the notion of guilt which characterizes the parental re-

lationships for so many children. In many homes the child's undesirable behavior has been treated by his parents as a personal affront to them, and the child has been led to believe that he has hurt his parents or shown them disrespect in such a way that he cannot have the parent's love or care until forgiveness is asked. This sense of guilt is directly related to his feeling of insecurity. The fact that the child has grieved the mother beyond words, and feels continuously out of relation with her, has been the source of many emotional difficulties. It is not surprising, therefore, that religion has tended to handle conduct on the same basis, raising it to the level of an all-powerful God in whose sight one is guilty and to whom one must make restitution before one's sin can be removed and relationship restored.

The difficulty with this method of handling conduct is that it focuses attention, not upon the consequences of behavior and how the behavior may be improved because of its undesirable results, but upon the anger of God and how He may be appeased. It becomes not only an emotional difficulty but places the attention at the wrong point, if improvement is to come. In the second place, it makes conscience a destructive rather than a constructive factor. Conscience is that about us which helps us to live up to our standards, which protests when we do not do so, which evidences satisfaction when we do. Placed on the guilt basis, conscience is used

negatively as the thing that tells you when you do wrong. Further, if it becomes this sense of guilt and is associated with the disapprovals of those whose love and approval one must have, it becomes so serious a source of emotion that instead of becoming an incentive to improvement it becomes the center of emotional disurbance. The religious worker must understand what he is doing and handle undesirable behavior on a constructive basis so that it makes for improvement, rather than on a destructive basis around the approvals and disapprovals of some person whose love and relationship one must have.

In conclusion, it must be evident from this discussion that religion is an integral factor in the successful adjustment of the individual and that religious attitudes and difficulties are fundamentally interrelated with personality patterns which dominate. Therefore, if the church is to deal intelligently and fairly with behavior, the minister and other religious workers will need to take the mental hygienist's approach, assume that the behavior is symptomatic, and learn out of the background experience what are really the causal factors. This is the reason that Mrs. Sophia Fahs, the principal of the Union School of Religion, feels that this Sunday-school must give definite attention to the personality problems of the children, that her teachers must have as much mental hygiene training as possible, and that expert help must be available where needed; and she is

moving toward this standard as fast as the resources of the school make it possible. This is the reason that one of the leading churches in New York City is planning to add in the near future a psychiatrist to its staff. This is the reason that mental hygiene should be a part of the preparation of every minister and religious worker, if he is to deal understandingly with those in the church and is to be able also to recognize the more serious cases which demand psychiatric help.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

WAYNE B. WHEELER

General Counsel and Legislative Superintendent Anti-Saloon League of America

Wayne B. Wheeler was in the front of temperance and prohibition battles for thirty-five years until his recent death. While a student in Oberlin College he was enlisted by Howard Hyde Russell, founder of the Anti-Saloon League, as one of the first workers in the new organization, and for many years he was prominent in the Ohio Anti-Saloon League. He aided in framing most of the prohibition legislation passed by Congress or the various States, and in over two thousand cases he successfully defended such legislation in the higher courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, never suffering a defeat in a case of any importance.

Dr. Wheeler informed and stimulated public sentiment on prohibition in practically every State in the Union. Pulpits, universities, clubs, and mass meetings invited him as the best known leader in the fight against the liquor traffic. His writings, whether on the technical legal questions of prohibition or on the more popular phases of the movement, have had a wide circulation. He was, of course, the favorite target for the attack and abuse of the liquor group.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

WAYNE B. WHEELER

As we recognize moral leadership of the nation, the church has definite obligations outside the distinctively religious field which it cannot properly ignore. Its mission in the world is not merely to preach but to save. It is called upon, not alone to be a hearer or a speaker of the word, but a doer. It is not enough for it to pray for the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven. Christ-minded men and women must also work for its coming. They must express their will for social righteousness. If that will is only the will of a minority, then it must utter itself as a protest and continue untiringly to preach, teach, and organize until it has become a majority. When that will is the will of the majority, it registers itself as law.

The church has no concern with laws that do not directly and seriously affect moral issues. It should not use the cannon of its thunders to blast a sparrow, however annoying the sparrow may be. It should champion only causes whose moral significance is worthy of its attention. Among such causes,

prohibition is probably the most important to-day.

Prohibition is essentially a moral movement. It is directed against a social evil which is indefensible morally. That evil could only be reached through the organized collective action of the moral forces of the nation, because it too was organized. The problem was neither individual, denominational, nor parochial. Neither pledge-giving nor saloon-restriction would solve it. When the church organized itself for effective action against the saloon, the saloon vanished and prohibition came. To-day the problem has altered its terms slightly, but it is the same moral question. The church aroused the people to write the prohibition law in the Constitution. It must now arouse its constituency to insist that this law be observed by right-minded people and enforced against the wrong-minded.

The church can best reduce violations of this law by preaching its observance as a moral obligation. Before the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment, the question of total abstinence was an open one with many people in the church as well as outside it. It was then debatable. To-day the question of total abstinence is absorbed in a greater question: obedience to the law which has been adopted by the will of the majority. The whole structure of constitutional government rests upon the theory of government by the majority will. Every constitutional guarantee of life, liberty, and happiness, of freedom to speak and freedom to worship, has neither

more nor less force than the Eighteenth Amendment prohibiting the beverage liquor traffic. The greatest leaders of the nation have forecast anarchy as the inevitable fruit of the wet philosophy, urging that citizens may violate a law if they disapprove it. Against these revolutionary doctrines, the church, as one of the guardians of liberty and righteousness, has the right to raise her voice. Obedience to the law is a moral obligation.

We need more education on the prohibition problem. There was a minority unreached when the law was adopted. Since then, each successive year has brought nearly two million youths to the age of citizenship. The new voter of 1927 was only fourteen years of age when the saloon was outlawed. He lacks personal knowledge of its evil. In many States, dry before national prohibition, men are well along in life to-day who never saw a licensed saloon. To them, the stories of the liquor orgies of the past are incredible. They see some law violations to-day but cannot comprehend that prohibition, under the worst conditions prevailing to-day anywhere in the United States, is infinitely better than the best conditions under license. They therefore are too often easy prey to the propagandists of the brewers. The church should point to "the pit from which we were digged." It must sound again the call to "remember Egypt" and the bondage from which this nation is free to-day.

The church should give to the millions of youths

now in her Sunday-schools, and the hosts who are in the colleges of the church, a clearer understanding of the iniquities in the liquor traffic, its essential lawlessness, and its position as the cause of more crime, pauperism, and misery than any other factor. It must provide perspective without which these hosts of new citizens advancing yearly to the ballot box cannot judge the merits of prohibition.

The alien in our midst must learn the lesson of law obedience. He can be reached by no other organization so readily or so effectively as by the church. The hosts of immigrants who came from lands where law is viewed as the instrument of the masters to keep the crowd in subjection must learn that here, in this land of liberty, law is the will of the majority, devised to insure to all the largest freedom. Under the rule of an autocracy or an aristocracy, it has long been a maxim that so long as an oppressed people drown their sorrows and forget their troubles in the flowing bowl they will not rise in revolt. Such maxims have no meaning in this republic. Instead of drink-sodden subjects, this land needs clear-minded, alert citizens able to play their part in self-government. The burdens of democracy cannot be borne by men who put an enemy into their mouths to steal away their brains. America asks her new citizens to renounce King Alcohol as well as other foreign potentates when they assume the privileges of Americans.

In training the immigrant or the children of aliens,

the church can help refute the vicious theory of the liquor group, that disobedience to the prohibitory law is a form of patriotism like unto the contempt shown by the colonists to the Stamp Act. Patriots may revolt against the despotic acts of a government in which they have no representation, but the free, self-governing citizens of a republic-democracy cannot palliate lawlessness with the claim that it is a higher patriotism. If ever "the powers that be are ordained of God," in the Pauline phrase, then it is in this land where the enlightened conscience of the free voter constitutes "the powers that be."

Equally valuable as a contribution to law observance and enforcement would be the church's presentation to its whole constituency, but especially to the alien, of the truth that the divine promises of good things in this life, conditioned on the observance of moral law, have been strikingly fulfilled since prohibition. The very comfort and ease in dry America which drew the average immigrant across the seas from his wet native land are the fruit of those American ideals which came to their culmination in prohibition. The nation embraced prohibition because it was right. It has found that it pays, just as all right and moral things ultimately pay in the material as well as in the spiritual sense.

The pulpit, the Sunday-school class and the other church organizations, the denominational publications from the great church magazine or paper to the Sunday-school lesson leaves, the gatherings of

synods, conventions, and conferences, and many other more local church agencies afford opportunity to preach this part of the gospel of love and salvation.

Education on this—or any other theme—is not enough, however. The church must organize also. It must suggest to its followers that "like a mighty army moves the church of God." It must emphasize the individual nature of the citizen's responsibility and the complementary truth that the individual responsibility can only be fulfilled by collective action. There is significance in the Bible statement that "one shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight." The multiplied force that comes from being "all with one accord in one place" is not unknown to the church. "When ye shall agree touching anything, it shall be done."

Much effective work for law enforcement can be done by organized Bible classes, men's clubs, or women's societies in the church. Such organizations should not employ detectives or attempt to do the work which properly belongs to those officials who are responsible for enforcing the law. They can, however, secure law enforcement through these officers, with whom at least the leaders of the church organizations should be personally acquainted. These officials are public servants. Their character and efficiency should be known to those who are interested in law and order. They should receive com-

mendation when they succeed, support when they loyally do their work, and protests when they slight or betray their task. When committees representing groups of church people attend trials of liquor cases, they can offset the bad influence of the wets who frequent court-rooms in some places. Such committees can give notice to officers of law violations.

There are times when some concrete case calls for practical action. Speak-easies or drinking clubs may be operated in the territory served by the church. The people of the church, as individuals or through some organization, should report these places to the proper officials. Where there is a state or local enforcement law, it is proper to make this report to the principal local officials such as mayor or chief of police, unless there is strong reason to believe that they will not act. The federal officers have so many cases affecting the sources of supply, conspiracy cases, or interstate cases that it is desirable that local or state officials function in the smaller cases.

If, after a reasonable time, there is no action by the local authorities, a second report should be made, this time to the principal law enforcement officer of the State. If he does not act, then turn to the headquarters of the federal enforcement authorities. Failing action there, notice should be sent to the Prohibition Unit, Washington, D. C. Copies should be kept of all letters reporting law violations.

A strong protest from the pulpit, with publicity in the local press, often effectively stirs slothful officials to action.

While it is not the duty of the private citizen, nor of religious organizations, to take over the detective work of the community, it is the duty of every citizen to report every law violation that comes to his or her notice. On this point, the Supreme Court of the United States has said:

> It is the duty and the right not only of every peace officer of the United States, but of every citizen, to assist in prosecuting and in securing the punishment of any breach of the peace of the United States. It is the right as well as the duty of every citizen, when called upon by the proper officer, to act as part of the posse comitatus in upholding the laws of his country. It is likewise his right and his duty to communicate to the executive officers any information which he has of the commission of any offense against those laws; and such information given by a private citizen, is a privileged and confidential communication, for which no action of libel or slander will lie, and the disclosure of which cannot be compelled without the assent of the government.

If an organization in the church makes known its interest in law enforcement, the public will supply it with the information sought.

Through these organizations those interested in enforcement of law can most effectively get in touch with members of Congress, state legislatures, and municipal legislative bodies to prevent weakening of present enforcement laws or ordinances and to

strengthen them where necessary. Where the church, as a church, cannot participate in the fight, the societies in the church, more secular in character, can act effectively. These organizations can multiply their influence and success by affiliation with like societies in the community.

Practically all the denominations have commissions, boards, or committees which direct the denominational work on temperance or prohibition. These bodies are, often, poorly financed. They cannot do the work which is expected of them for lack of funds. An adequate program, adequately supported, would develop interest in the prohibition cause and would make more effective the educational work of the denomination.

The church constituency, coöperating first in the local church organization, should be so related and affiliated to other groups, and the denominational organization should be so connected with other denominational organizations, that a united front is presented to the foe of the Kingdom of Heaven. It is a sad truth that "history is red with the blood of the unorganized." For the sake of helpless childhood, of motherhood, of the "weaker brother for whom Christ died," for the sake of everything that is both dear and precious in Christian civilization, the church should emphasize the need of organization and united effort that crosses denominational lines.

It was to meet that need that the Anti-Saloon

League was formed, as an interdenominational, nonpartizan organization to represent the churches officially in their fight against the liquor traffic. Controlled and directed by the churches, its success during the past thirty years indicates what may be achieved by united effort of the churches.

Frankness impels recognition of another duty which the church cannot neglect if it intends to make itself a serious factor in law obedience and law enforcement. This fight cannot be won unless the costs of the war are paid. It is interesting to recall that one of the first things the early disciples did was to organize a financial plan. They sought a Kingdom of God, and they arranged to finance its development. Fighting that kingdom's highly organized foe to-day, the church will have to finance generously the instruments doing her work. As the wettest papers in the nation have several times suggested, the easiest way to defeat prohibition would be to cut off the income of the most active dry organizations. Then wet propaganda would be unanswered, wet officials and legislators could betray the people, and the morale of the dry support in the churches would speedily crumble. If the church continues its war against the false gods of the liquor traffic, it must pay the costs of that war.

Any church that feels that its "parish is the world" must also feel an impulse toward the international prohibition cause. It is part of the missionary movement of the kingdom. That a "drunkard

cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven" is as true in other lands as in our own. As there was nothing local or parochial about the liquor traffic, so there is nothing national about it.

The liquor traffic in Europe has organized to fight prohibition in the United States or in any other land where it threatens outlawry of this criminal traffic. It publicly declares that it is financing the wet fight in the United States, is taking an active part in our political campaign, and is trying to break down support of the dry cause here. The world fight against the liquor traffic is intimately bound up with the home fight against it, just as the foreign mission movement is an essential part of our home mission work. There are no nations in the Kingdom of God, which is one. The church can give to its constituency the world vision in this, as in other phases of the social regeneration of the world.

To the wet complaint that the church should not interfere in this fight, that it should point the way to heaven and leave to the worldings the affairs of this world, the church may return the reply of a famous evangelist to a godless critic: "I hope my conduct will always deserve your disapproval." From the days of the plain-spoken Hebrew prophets with their ringing declarations that God demanded national righteousness, through the stinging admonitions of the Gospels and the apostolic writings, to the stress upon the social message of the church to-day, there is an uninterrupted insistence on the

positive duty of the people of God to bring in a reign of right and truth. There is no other single foe to that reign so treacherous, deadly, or active as the liquor traffic. We cannot be unequally yoked with it, and live. We cannot serve God and this Mammon of unrighteousness. Between this serpent and the seed of the woman, God has put unending enmity. To all the apologists and fearful defeatists who urge retreat from this war against the Liquor Demon, the church can reply in the words of Peter the Hermit, preaching the Crusade: "God wills it." When the church equally "wills it," the annihilation of the liquor traffic, now far advanced, will be complete.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE

PROFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, YALE UNIVERSITY

The common problems of religion and education have been the mainspring of Dr. Weigle's widespread leadership. Chief among his interests has been the promotion of religious education.

After securing his early training in the public schools of Pennsylvania and at Gettysburg College, Dr. Weigle received his Ph.D. degree from Yale in 1905. From then until 1916 he was professor of philosophy at Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota, carrying an active part in the development of education in the State. During those years he was responsible for preparing and placing the hundreds of teachers who went out from Carleton College, and he was president of the Minnesota Education Association in 1913.

Returning to Yale in 1916, he became professor of Christian nurture, and since 1924 has been professor of religious education. He has lectured frequently before interdenominational groups, colleges, and theological seminaries. His influence has been world-wide through his effective work in directing such organizations as the International Council of Religious Education, the World's Sunday School Association, the International Sunday School Lesson Committee, and many others.

His books have been stimulating and valuable to those devoted to the interests of the church and its educational opportunities. These include *The Pupil and the Teacher,* of which more than half a million copies have been used, *Talks to Sunday School Teachers,* and *The Training of Children in the Christian Family.* He has also been co-author of *Training the Devotional Life* and *The Teaching Work of the Church.*

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE

Mr. H. G. Wells has called attention to the "curious exceptional disentanglement of religious teaching from formal education which is a distinctive feature of our age," and concludes that "this divorce of religious teaching from organized education is necessarily a temporary one, a transitory dislocation, and that presently education must become again in intention and spirit religious." "Education," he goes on to say, "is the preparation of the individual for the community, and his religious training is the core of that preparation."

Education and religion belong together. Neither attains its full end without the other. Education is defective if it fails to beget moral character; and character is most surely established only when it is undergirded and sustained by a faith that the constitution of the universe itself is moral. That faith is religion.

On the other hand, religion needs education. A religious experience which is out of relation to one's education does not have the same promise

of permanence and fruitfulness as a faith which is rooted in the changing experiences and expanding powers of the passing years. Without education, religion condemns itself to ignorance and ineffectiveness.

The whole life and work of the Christian church may indeed be conceived in educational terms. The church exists for the purpose for which the Master came, that men might have life and have it more abundantly. The primary interest of the church is in persons; its concern is for the enrichment of their experience, the development of their character, and the quality of their services as free, responsible, coöperative members of the human race. In the power of the Spirit of God, the church undertakes the regeneration and Christian education of individuals.

So close is this natural relationship of education and religion that when for any reason they become sundered they begin to wear an air of rivalry. Education begins to usurp the place of religion; and men in the name of religion begin to decry education and even to legislate against science.

America is a land of churches and of schools. Most of its citizens profess religion and desire education. Yet in America, as throughout the world, a relative secularization of education has taken place within the last hundred years. The control of the schools has passed from the hands of the churches into those of the state; and religion has been almost

wholly eliminated from the program and curriculum of public education.

This movement is due in part to causes which are world-wide. Among these causes are the rise and development of nationalism in education; the growth of the spirit, ideals, and institutions of democracy; the rapid progress of invention and discovery, and the expansion of the sciences and arts; the utilitarianism and materialism consequent upon the industrial revolution; and the jealous sectarianism of the churches themselves.

Other causes are especially characteristic of America: the newness of the country, the relative lack of tradition, and the existence, until recently, of a frontier; the heterogeneity of the population; the complete religious freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; the multiplicity of religious sects and denominations which has resulted from that freedom; and the absolute separation of church and state which is a fundamental principle of our political organization and corporate life. These causes have tended to accelerate movements toward the secularization of education which in Europe have been somewhat checked by the force of old customs and traditions and by the established connections of church and state.

The churches have rendered effective service, throughout the history of this country, in the establishment and maintenance of schools of every grade. In colonial days the churches generally, save

in New England, maintained elementary schools for the children of those who could not afford to pay for their tuition in private schools. In the early nineteenth century the churches took the lead in establishing academies and colleges. The academies have been largely replaced by public high schools; but five sixths of the colleges and universities of the United States were founded and nurtured by the churches, and three fourths of them still bear direct relation to the churches.

The policy of public responsibility for education, which has become the policy of the country as a whole, was a policy of the New England churches, and was made possible in the beginning by the interpenetration of church and State which characterized the New England colonies. The spread of the principle of public education throughout the States, and the ultimate victory of this principle in the hard-fought battle for free public schools, was largely due, as Cubberley has shown, to the missionary zeal and devoted labors of men, many of whom were ministers, of Calvinistic heritage, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Reformed; and they were reinforced, in this field, by Protestant Episcopal, Baptist, and Methodist.

We have ample reason to rejoice in our public schools. They have faults, be it granted; but their virtues justify the confidence we have placed in them. They are reaching more children than ever before. More than ninety-two per cent. of the chil-

dren and young people who are in the elementary and secondary schools of this country are enrolled in the public schools rather than in private or parochial schools. The public schools are holding children for a longer time than ever before. The amount of schooling received by the average American child has more than doubled in the last fifty years. And the public schools of to-day touch children's lives and influence their development at many more points than the schools of even a generation ago. We now rely upon the public schools to afford children much in the way of sense-experience, motor training, and moral discipline which under simpler social conditions was afforded to children by the incidental contacts of everyday life in the home and community. The schools of to-day constitute a fairly faithful transcript or reproduction, on a small scale, of life itself. It is the business of the school, says the foremost philosopher of present-day public education, John Dewey, to afford to children a social environment which is simpler and purer, yet wider, better balanced, more rightly proportioned than the particular social environment in which they chance to be born.

In one respect, however, the public schools are distinctly failing to provide the education which American children need and must have if America is to retain its character as the home of a free, upright, and God-fearing people. They are failing with respect to religion. They do not afford to re-

ligion a place commensurate with its importance as a factor in our heritage, as an expression of our common faith, and as a principle undergirding and sustaining our moral well-being. With the exception of the reading of a few verses from the Bible and the recital of the Lord's Prayer in the schools of some States and communities, the teaching of religion has disappeared from these schools, and they afford to children no conscious recognition of the part that religion has played and is playing in the life of humanity.

The public schools are not themselves to blame for this situation. It was forced upon them by the quarrels and protests of the churches, or by folk who assumed to speak in behalf of the churches. Whenever a group, or even an individual, has chosen to object, on what are averred to be conscientious grounds, to some religious element in the program or curriculum of the public schools, that element has forthwith been eliminated, and no other religious element has taken its place. The movement has been almost wholly negative; there has been no coming together of the different religious groups for a positive reconsideration of its total trend and inevitable result. It was not infidels or atheists who stripped the public schools of religion. It was people who spoke in the name of religion. The fact is that adherents of all faiths in America have been far more concerned to see to it that the public schools should not contain any element to which they could object,

than they have been to conserve in these schools the great fundamental principles of morals and religion upon which they all agree. Protestant, Catholic, and Jew have shared in this movement. All must shoulder some of the responsibility for the situation into which we have drifted.

This situation is fraught with danger. It imperils the future of religion among our people, and, with religion, the future of the nation itself. It endangers the perpetuity of the most characteristic and essential principles of American life and American institutions.

A system of public schools that omits and ignores religion fails to bring children into contact with the best that the experience of the race has to offer. "Through its schools a nation should become conscious of the abiding sources from which the best movements in its life have always drawn their inspiration," a contemporary English philosopher of education has said. "The schools should be an idealized epitome and model of the world, not merely the world of ordinary affairs, but the whole of humanity, body and soul, past, present, and future." Professor W. E. Hocking has so well stated the danger in the present situation that I quote his striking sentences. He is referring to the objection which Bertrand Russell voices against "immersing defenseless children" in the atmosphere of the older generation's faiths, political and religious. "The first peril of education is not that the child's will will be over-

borne, but that through no exposure or inadequate exposure to the objects that would call out his best responses, he achieves only half a will instead of a whole one, a will partly developed and, therefore, feebly initiative, casual, spiritless, uninterested. . . . The greatest danger of politically guided education, particularly in democracies which feel themselves obliged in their educational enterprises to cancel out against one another the divergent opinions of various parties, is that the best places will be *left blank,* because it is on the most vital matters that men most differ. Children have rights which education is bound to respect. The first of these rights is not that they be left free to choose their way of life, i. e., to make bricks without either straw or clay. Their first right is that they be offered something positive, the best the group has so far found. Against errors and interested propaganda the growing will has natural protection: it has *no protection against starvation.*"

The danger is not simply one of omission, of failure to offer to children the best. The present situation tacitly commits the public schools to a negative attitude with respect to religion. It conveys to children a negative suggestion. They cannot help but notice the omission. It inevitably discredits religion in their minds. It is natural for them to conclude that religion is negligible, or unimportant, or irrelevant to the real business of life.

This danger is greater to-day than ever before,

just because the public schools are greater to-day than ever before. For the old-time public school to omit religion would have been a matter of little consequence, for it omitted a great many things. But to-day the public schools are taking on the dimensions of life itself. They undertake to afford to children a social environment simpler, purer, wider, better balanced, and more rightly proportioned—to repeat Dewey's phrases—than the big, confused, and too often sordid world without their bounds. They provide for the education of children in practically every other sound human interest—except religion. The ignoring of religion by such schools conveys a powerful condemnatory suggestion.

The principle of religious freedom is fundamental to the well-being of America. It touches bed-rock in its truth. The separation of church and State is a guarantee of our liberties. But we must not so construe the separation of church and State as to prevent their mutual recognition and coöperation. We must not so interpret it as to make out of the schools of the State seed-plots of non-religion or atheism.

We must keep sectarianism out of the public schools, but that does not necessitate stripping them of religion. We must not surrender the public schools to the sectarianism of atheism. The present situation does not fully conserve, it in some respects impairs, the religious freedom of that vast

majority of American citizens who believe in God and desire that the education of their children should give natural and proper place to religious faith.

One thing should in justice be said. The most potent religious influence in the life of any school is to be found in the moral and religious character of the teacher. The public schools of America are not irreligious, because their teachers are almost everywhere men and women of strong moral character and of definite religious conviction. Without the direct teaching of religion, these teachers, by the character of their discipline and by the spirit which they maintain in the life of the schools, have been and are of profound influence in determining the character of American boys and girls.

But what a mockery of the judgment and goodwill of the American people this situation presents! Unable to agree upon any religious principles which we are willing to make a part of the common education of our children, we shut religion out of the schools officially, then say that we will rely upon the spirit and individual initiative of the teachers.

Some propose that the introduction of what they term "character education" in the public schools will solve the problem. We stand in woeful need of more direct and vital methods of moral education in these schools. But we delude ourselves if we imagine that the introduction of non-religious character-education in the public schools will solve the problem or quiet the conscience of those who have

waked to the danger of an educational system without religious motivation. Direct character-education but raises the problem of the ultimate sanctions of morality. If the public schools must teach that right is merely what men have agreed upon, nothing more than convention, or fashion, or public opinion, or legal enactment by a majority in some legislatures —if they are estopped from saying that some things are right because we believe them to be rooted in the constitution of the universe itself, expressions of the nature and will of God—then we are in the presence of a new danger. Shall the State teach that right is mere fashion, and the church that it has the stamp of eternity? That would be a conflict in the field of morality beside which the supposed conflict between evolution and Genesis is child's play.

What, now, have we a right to expect of the public schools? Clearly we cannot expect the public schools to do the whole work, or even to undertake a major share of the religious education of American children. This is for two reasons which are so obvious as to need no discussion: first, because a complete religious education could not be offered by the public schools without transgressing the principle of religious freedom; second, because the growth of religion in the mind depends upon a multitude of factors too intimate and too pervasive to be embraced within the limits of organized, formal schooling.

We have a right to expect the public schools to do more than they have been doing, however. They can take steps to offset or wholly void the negative suggestion involved in the present situation. They can in many States continue the reading from the Bible and the use of the Lord's Prayer—an act of corporate worship in which all religious groups might well agree to unite; and by the careful selection of materials this practice could be made to be of more religious-educational value than it now is. The public schools can and should in all of their teaching deal with religion naturally and wholesomely, without dogmatism, without bias, without affectation or strain. They can and should in all of their teaching manifest due reverence for God and due respect for religious beliefs. Teachers should understand that the principle of religious freedom is designed to protect rather than to destroy religious belief, and that it gives them no right either tacitly to suggest or actually to teach irreligion. The public schools can aim at the development of a citizenship which is founded upon character; and they can in their efforts to educate for character give due recognition to religious sanctions. They can teach that morality is more than custom, public opinion, or legal enactment; they can point to its grounding in the structure of the universe and in the nature of God. The public schools can offset the present negative suggestion by affording to the work of the churches and synagogues for the religious educa-

tion of their children some such recognition as will show to the children themselves in unmistakable terms that their teachers realize that religion is a proper part of the community's total provision for their education, rather than a mere bit of embroidery tacked on by a few enthusiasts.

It is from this latter standpoint that the growing practice of excusing children from the public schools at their parents' request for religious instruction in week-day church schools is to be justified. That practice is a proper recognition by the State of the fact that in education both church and State, as well as the parent, are interested and should coöperate. It is a desirable form of recognition because it so definitely conveys to the mind of the child the suggestion that religion, instead of being the negligible thing that it now appears to be, is of important and vital interest to the school, the community, and the State, as well as to the churches. There is cause for congratulation that the courts of the State of New York, in the recent White Plains Case, have so clearly seen and stated this principle and have steadfastly refused to surrender the public schools of that State to the sectarianism of a small group of secularists and atheists.

What have we a right to expect of the churches and synagogues? The churches should conceive their relation to children in religious-educational terms rather than in terms merely of a social suggestion or mass-meeting enthusiasm. They should

realize that they are responsible for a share of the education of American children; and they should undertake to maintain church schools for the teaching of religion that will match up in point of educational efficiency with the public schools, and will appear to the minds of the children themselves to be the correlate and complement of the public schools. This many churches and synagogues have already begun to do. This purpose lies back of the present widespread movement toward better religious education through graded Sunday-schools and week-day schools of religion.

The churches and synagogues should approach one another in mutual understanding, and coöperate, more largely and more responsibly than they have hitherto done, in a common educational purpose and policy. They must cease their over-emphasis upon differences, to the neglect of their common faith and aspiration, which has been responsible for the present situation. It is because we have in America, not the State and the church, nor even the State and a group of coöperating churches, but rather the State and a hundred disagreeing churches, that it has been necessary for the State, in the fulfilment of its educational function, to pass the churches by. Let that situation cease; let the various religious bodies agree on an educational policy with respect both to their own teaching work and to the sort of recognition that they desire religion to be afforded by and in the public schools; let them do

their own teaching work and to the sort of recognition that they desire religion to be afforded by and in the public schools; let them do their share of the education of children in a way that merits recognition; and a fit measure of recognition is made possible and will almost certainly follow. Fortunately in some communities such a movement is well begun; and we have come to see that folk of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths can after all agree upon certain practical principles of educational policy which make possible the religious education of the children of each group, without infringing upon their several rights or transgressing the principle of religious freedom which is embodied in our national Constitution.

The times demand of the churches a larger measure of coöperation than they have yet been willing to undertake. It is not enough to pray for revivals, not enough to organize competent church schools for the teaching of religion. One must face squarely the problem of coöperation with the State, as the State fulfills its responsibility for the education of its future citizens. It is one of the tragedies of our time that Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, Fundamentalist, Evangelical, and Modernist, should quarrel with one another, while the real enemy of us all, the most insidious foe of American institutions, the secularism and irreligion of the day, takes possession of our schools and wins its way to the minds of our children.

COMMUNITY RECREATION

LE ROY E. BOWMAN

Secretary and Editor, National Community Center Association

Chief among the early influences in Dr. Bowman's life were the broad expanses of the Illinois corn-fields and an intense religious faith which came to him at the age of fifteen. From that time he was a leader in the church activities of the young people, and after finishing his college work he went to the University of Chicago to study for the Baptist ministry. Experiences in Chicago attracted him to the study of sociology, and he soon went to New York to take up work with men and boys in a settlement which under his direction expanded into a true community organization. Responding to the war need of providing organized recreation for the men in training, he became national personnel director of the War Camp Community Service. Following the war, as a part of the reconstruction program of the Red Cross, he prepared the plans for coördinating health and relief agencies that are now embodied in the East Harlem Health Center.

For the past six years Dr. Bowman has given courses related to community organization in the Social Science Department of Columbia University. Since organizing the New York City Recreation Committee five years ago, which affiliated forty-five city-wide recreation agencies, he has directed its work as secretary. For a number of years he has been secretary of the National Community Center Association, and he is now chairman of the New York Chapter of the League for Industrial Democracy. Together with these responsibilities, he has found time to participate in a metropolitan coöperative enterprise.

He is a contributing editor of the *Journal of Social Forces,* in charge of the department of neighborhood and community, and has published numerous articles in other magazines.

COMMUNITY RECREATION

LE ROY E. BOWMAN

One measure of adaptation of present-day conditions that a social institution has achieved is to be found in the attitude of that institution toward the prevailing forms of recreation. Recreation is as spontaneous an expression of a people as exists. If the church does not understand nor sympathize with it, there is surely a fundamental difference that should be seriously regarded by its leaders if the church hopes to have any considerable influence on social developments. The phrase suggests the implication: will the church "have influence on" the community, or will there be a mutual influence and perhaps mutual change? It is a matter of observation to what extent the community goes to the church; the church can understand the community best by studying, appreciating, welcoming the neighbors according to their "behavior," as the psychologists say; that is, as they are in their leisure moments. The church, especially the Protestant, has inherited an old complex against recreation; for in early days in Rome, and in later days in other parts of Chris-

tendom, it was in revolt against excesses that were degenerating and socially unwholesome. It is difficult now for the church to take an attitude different from its moralistic condemnation and withdrawal, despite the fact that to-day recreation is in the main a wholesome compensation for an over-mechanized civilization, a step at least human away from materialism; and despite the fact that psychology and psychiatry have demonstrated the greater effectiveness for reform purposes of a non-moralistic approach.

Apparently the Protestant Church has no uniform or thought-out attitude toward recreation. There is difference in attitude as between denominations, as between city and country churches in the same denomination, as between parts of the country, as between the leaders and the rank and file, as between Modernists and Fundamentalists. Church provision of recreational facilities or participation in community efforts have been until recently quite sporadic. There are many writings on the theory and the practice of recreation, giving principles, general procedure, and detailed programs. These writings have been perhaps too sweeping in their claims for the benefits to the church from recreational activities, but they have had much of suggestive value. Recreation has not been utilized generally as a resource, as has been advocated by the majority of writers (churchmen for the most part) who have dealt with this subject, nor accepted as a field in which the church might find new light and life. Social values,

coöperative habits, and morals develop in recreative activity. The church has often been too busy bringing the story of these things in old forms to the community to see them growing in their crude but virile modern state. There are now a number of organized efforts within the denominations to make available facts and advice regarding recreation as a church resource or activity, efforts not very intensive as compared to major efforts in the institution, but promising. These bureaus are aided by a helpful Church Relations Department under J. W. Faust in the Playground and Recreation Association of America.[1]

Many examples of very successful community recreation programs conducted by progressive churches should recommend themselves to any conscientious or ambitious pastor. In particular one might be mentioned, the Winnetka, Illinois, Congregational Church, which conducts a community house nationwide in its repute for social activities and its effect in not only building up an active membership but in creating a superlative regard in the whole community for the church. There are in the community house: dramatics, various classes in social subjects, tennis, dancing, boy scouts and similar organizations, motion-pictures and many special and incidental programs.[2]

[1] See *The Playground,* August, 1926, p. 289.

[2] Other such church efforts can be found described by Howard Wright Gates, *Recreation and the Church,* University of Chicago

A questionnaire was sent to the city federations of churches, and replies were received from a large proportion of them, including: Chicago, Boston, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, San Francisco, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Youngstown, Toledo, Wichita, and Cleveland. The secretaries are unanimous, with one exception, that recreational activities are increasing in the churches, especially basketball, baseball, and outing activities. The gymnasium has been successful in some places, decidedly not successful in others. Dancing flourishes in some churches, but is taboo in at least a considerable fraction of city churches of certain well-known denominations. It was generally felt that the type of ac-

---

Press. A list of eighty successful churches with recreational facilities and activities is given in *The Church and Community Recreation,* by Albert B. Wegener, Macmillan Co., 1924. Advice and detailed programs can be found in *Handbook for Workers with Young People,* James V. Thompson, Abingdon Press, 1922; *Phrenology,* E. O. Harbin, Cokesbury Press, 1923; *The Church's Program for Young People,* Herbert C. Mayer, Century Co., 1925 (a bibliography follows each chapter dealing with specific activities); *Social Plans for Young People,* Christian F. Reisner, Abingdon Press, 1908; especially civic and coöperative church enterprises in *Community Programs for Coöperating Churches,* Roy B. Guild, Association Press; games for churches in *The Church and the Young Man's Game,* F. J. Milness, George H. Doran Company, 1913; *Handy Loose Leaf Notes,* Lynn Rohrbaugh, sixth edition, October, 1925; *Recreational Leadership for Church and Community,* Warren T. Powell, Methodist Book Concern, 1923; *The Church at Play,* Norman E. Richardson, Abingdon Press, 1922; and especially *The Church and the People's Play,* Henry A. Atkinson, Pilgrim Press, 1915.

tivity provided had not materially adapted itself to the peculiarities of the neighborhood except in a few "down-town" mission churches. Should the church attempt to provide for the leisure time of others than its own members? The universal opinion was: yes, it should serve its neighborhood, or "those who need," or in several instances "the community in so far as the need is not met by other agencies." It is certain, however, judging by these good authorities, that the problem is not easily solved. Recreational activities have been known to be failures in churches occasionally, and the leaders are saying that the church should not enter a field that locally is filled. Further, the fundamental basis of success, in this as in other lines, is trained, adequate leadership. Not every pastor is a good dancing instructor, and unless the church has continuous adequate leadership for its social activities they are apt to fail, or to succeed only temporarily. Some city secretaries urge, instead of recreational enterprises other than those requiring little equipment or leadership of moderate training, coöperation with the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. A very few writers and leaders urge close coöperation with secular agencies.

The Cleveland Survey (*The Sphere of Private Agencies,* published by the Cleveland Foundation Committee, 1920, Chapter IV) led to the conclusion that the church was best fitted for recreation requiring little equipment, unless a large clientele is to be served and adequate training is possessed by the

leaders. The reason is partly that one church serves a relatively small number of each special age and sex group, and training has become specialized to an extent requiring a considerable number to justify, for example, a girls' worker, a boys' worker, a dancing instructor. One method has not been tried out very extensively by churches, and that is co-operative or combined provision and leadership for several churches. In baseball leagues that are developing in many different parts of the country the churches are making a very promising beginning.

Recreation has been heralded as of group-making value, as a means to make people "folks" who like and understand each other. The idea is just as wrong as right and can lead to huge mistakes. We have more enjoyment with those we know who are apt to be like us and who also very likely are in the groups we are in. The first ways to get acquainted are not intimate recreational associations, despite all the enthusiastic statements, but rather associations such as civic activities that do not require too great cordiality until one is acquainted and that provide the opportunity at that time to decline intimacy. Another factor of like nature is the cultural background of the participants. Obviously their backgrounds, if various, make the social contacts, which are so much an expression of previous culture, very difficult. We are told in a recent magazine article that the community church in suburbs is a result partly of selling houses on the instalment plan, bringing together

people of diverse denominations. They can afford for the community one church, and that often becomes a community multi-denominational or non-denominational institution. Probably, however, it is made up of "citified" fairly prosperous persons of the middle class and "American" ideology. The community church on the whole has flourished in rural or small-town communities where also a bond of common attitudes and like economic condition has held against differing (and weakening) denominational ties. The cultural element should be enlisted as an ally. Protestant auspices for recreational and social activities in strictly Catholic communities such as the immigrant colonies have been of little avail. The rapid development of Catholic clubs, centers, community houses, attests the greater value of the cultural factor as a basis for religio-recreational activities. A more striking development is the mushroom growth in certain of the largest cities of the Jewish community center, organized to give expression and self-realization within an understanding group to the Jew who does not think or worship as his fathers did. Max Kadushkin in *The Jewish Center* for June, 1926, advocates the nourishment through the Jewish center of Jewish group consciousness. He expresses the general opinion of representative Jewish workers in the field. "What fosters group-consciousness among any people is its culture; its language, literature, traditions, its folk art and music. . . . The synagogue is no longer the Jewish

communal institution. . . . The task of the Community Center is far more simple and more calculated to meet conditions as they now exist." In the centers the family is the unit of recreation, a factor of influence in holding together the cultural groups that causes speculation regarding the specialization in age and sex groups that is going on in many other institutions providing leisure time activities. Recreation is an element in the retention of culture, group habits, morals, and the adaptation to a new social situation. It seems to succeed best when carefully correlated with racial and social habits.

The attitude of the majority of writers on the relation of the church and recreation we may regard as indicative of the general aim of Protestants in the use of social and fun-making devices. In general the desire seems to be to help the churches build up membership, cement social solidarity within the churches, keep those who come busy and happy, and especially to prevent the immoral, unsocial, or degrading influences of commercial recreation or even general community affairs from forming concepts and habits in the mind of the young people the church may influence. The general assumption is that the values, the vision, the moral standards of the church are superior to any others and that values, habits, standards that differ from those of the church are in some measure base. Actually there is no general agreement on social habits and standards as between churches or within a denomination.

Actually the church is changing with a changing generation, and new contacts, new knowledge, new individual and social controls render the old moralisms obsolete. Edwards, for example,[1] notes, as the significant features of the situation, professionalism, commercialism, immorality. He, in keeping with the majority of his confrères, sees the big function of the church as regarding recreation that of restriction of evil practices in the community, protection for those in the church. It is moderate to say that recreation workers, including Christians, do not see such inherent tendency to evil in play as many churchmen still think. Professionalism needs to be correlated with other things, but is not to be feared; commercialism in leisure time matters has been a boon to the great mass of people, and has been more responsive to changing demands than other forms of provision; morality is a matter of fair social relations, not of patterns of expression, and what may seem different or undignified is not necessarily base.

Recreation is good in itself, and the church, if it seeks to find the truth, will recognize the fact. It also is a more genuine expression of the individual and the crowd than many of our more regimented institutions. It is, therefore, in the nature of the teachings of religious prophets who have urged sincerity above forms, consideration, and fair play —which in recreation is called sportsmanship— above the hard dictates of old conventions. New

[1] *Christianity and Amusement,* Association Press, 1916.

values, new morals, new habits, arise out of association, often out of leisure time associations. The good of the future is often wrapped up in the social fun of the present. In recreation of the neighbors the church can get closest to them, help them to express themselves more completely, and by so doing serve one of to-day's greatest needs. People learn how to be fair, honest, loyal, more in active participation in social affairs than in passive reception of past—even religious—codes. A combination of prophecy, expanding the ethics developed in face-to-face association to the wider reaches of human brotherhood, and of coöperative active effort, appears to be a sound basis for church growth.

THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION AND THE CHURCHES

JOHN R. MOTT

General Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association

John R. Mott represents the significant adaptation to the modern problems of organized Christianity of that order of executive and administrative ability which has created the larger enterprises of commerce and of industry. It is probable that his greatest contribution to religion has been his enlarged conception of the possibilities of Christian effort on a world-wide scale. He has been able to see the wider opportunity and to devise plans adequate to the end in view and to secure support necessary to their accomplishment.

Dr. Mott has been a secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association since his graduation from Cornell University in 1888. He has served the national organization as student secretary and associate general secretary for foreign work. Since 1915 he has been general secretary. In 1926, at the World Conference at Helsingfors, Finland, he was elected chairman of the World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations. During the World War he directed the American welfare work for American soldiers, for the allied armies, and for prisoners of war.

His relationship with the international mission of Christianity has been continuous and intimate. As chairman of the Student Volunteer Movement and of the International Missionary Council, and as general secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation, he participated in the establishment of each of these important organizations more than twenty years ago; he serves still as chairman of the Federation and the Missionary Council.

These central interests have found expression in numerous books and articles. Many passages in his writings indicate entire sympathy with the mystical elements in religion; but the emphasis upon personal conduct, upon careful planning and organization, and upon unity achieved through coöperative effort leave little doubt that the writer regards tangibles as belonging among the essentials.

THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION AND THE CHURCHES

JOHN R. MOTT

Were the question raised with reference to any community whether a Christian church, or a Young Men's Christian Association, or a school, or a hospital should first be planted, the unassailable answer would be, the Christian church—because that would make possible and certain the ultimate, and perchance the early establishment, of all these other manifestations of the spirit of Jesus, and the application of his principles, and the communicating of his superhuman power.

The Young Men's Christian Association is in no sense a church. It does not perform what are properly regarded as the distinctive functions of the church. Nor is it a substitute for the Church of Christ. It is not an end in itself, but is tributary to the church. It does not, when it exists in its true place, in any sense weaken the church, but rather strengthens its hands. It should never be regarded, therefore, as a competitor or rival of the church.

The Young Men's Christian Association was established by the churches, not by ecclesiastical act,

but just as truly, through the initiative and action of some of their most loyal, most active, most Christ-like members—with the full approval of their clergy. Church members established the parent association in England and the pioneer associations in North America. There is no land where the Association was ever planted by anybody save by the loyal and active members of the churches.

The Young Men's Christian Association is very largely supported by the churches. Any close student of the financial streams that have made possible the carrying forward of this great work has had occasion to know this. It is true not only in so far as money is concerned, but it is likewise true of leadership. There is no outstanding secretarial or lay leader in the Association brotherhood who is not a loyal member of a church. Likewise the moral and spiritual support of the Association comes from this same vital source.

It is not always borne in mind that every notable advance, every striking change in policy, every historic piece of foundation-laying, has taken place only in consultation with and usually under the immediate guidance of leaders of the churches. Who should take deeper satisfaction, therefore, in the progress and accomplishments of the Young Men's Christian Association than the recognized clerical and lay leaders of the churches? They should claim it as a part of their work. They should foster it in every way in their power. Of an Association man

speaking critically of the church, or, on the other hand, of a leader of the church speaking disparagingly of the Association, it may aptly be said, "As well might the life-saving service disparage the lighthouses; as well might the child apologize for the parent, or the parent for the child."

Before the Detroit International Convention, held in 1919, certain leaders of the Association movement asked the International Committee to appoint a representative commission of recognized leaders of the churches to deal in an open-minded, thorough, courageous way with these relationships. Nobody has questioned the impartiality shown in the make-up of that commission, with President Mackenzie of Hartford Theological Seminary as chairman and trusted thinkers and administrators of nearly all the great communions, North and South, as members. The commission voiced its opinion that this work of bringing about a better understanding and relationship called for a process, not simply a convention act; and their recommendations led ultimately to the setting up of a permanent Counseling Commission of the Churches, each of some twenty denominations having already designated or appointed an official representative to serve upon it. This commission holds regular annual meetings and deals with large questions of common concern.

What are some of the causes of unsatisfactory relationship, wherever such exists? One, and perhaps the greatest cause, is not wrong intention but

sheer ignorance on the part of leaders of the Associations or of the churches, or of both. There has been failure to give adequate instruction to the men who are being trained for the secretaryship on the one hand, and to the men who are being trained for the Christian ministry on the other, concerning the principles, history, organization, relationships, and programs of the churches and of the Association movement.

Another cause of maladjustment is the lack of team-work on the part of those who direct the planning and activity of churches and Associations. Thus they present to the enemies of Christianity the unmistakable impression that there is wanting effective unity among us.

Added to this lack of team play, there is frequent failure to deal promptly and adequately with cases of misunderstanding, or maladjustment, which accentuates the difficulty, perpetuates it, and in turn creates other misunderstandings, sometimes affecting the attitude of an entire denomination.

A fundamental cause of maladjustment is failure to generate the atmosphere in which the largest confidence and coöperation are made possible. Convention findings, resolutions, legislation, and executive action are of little worth unless there exists an atmosphere in which we come to loathe to differ, and to determine to understand. That will bring us out into the great open places and into the clear light of God's presence. In His light we see light.

We come to understand one another and to love to coöperate.

A want of clear, comprehensive, unselfish, and conclusive thinking explains much of the trouble. A lack of clear thinking among the leaders always results in confusion. There is with some a lack of comprehensive thinking; some men are doing intensely clear thinking but in narrow grooves. There is lack of unselfish thinking by some; their minds are already made up, and they are determined to have their own way. Poor thinking leads to poor acting, or no acting, with resulting unsatisfactory relations.

Let us now outline a constructive policy. At the outset we should recognize the necessity of regular, timely, and thorough consultation on the part of the leaders, whether locally, in state areas, nationally, or internationally.

In addition to these stated conferences at regular intervals, a beaten path of friendship should be maintained between Association leaders and the leadership of the church forces, and these friendships should be kept in repair. There should be a great many informal contacts. There should be a constant unburdening of problems and a sharing of joys and a continual fellowship in prayer and counsel. More and more importance should be attached to this friendly relationship. There should be frequent reciprocal report on facts of progress and new plans and difficulties; the churches on the

one hand, and the Association on the other, should seek to play into each other's hands and to develop real and intimate coöperation.

The Young Men's Christian Association should do important pioneer work on behalf of the churches in certain places and in behalf of certain classes who at first cannot be brought within the range of the direct work of the churches. A notable illustration is the marvelous service which the Young Men's Christian Association rendered among the six million prisoners of the World War. Further illustrations might be drawn from the railway service, from industrial plants, from the army and the navy, from the immigration streams, and from parts of the work in foreign lands. Surely the churches need such an agency as this to establish contacts and help introduce, mediate, interpret Christ and the church and to draw men toward him and toward the church.

Again, the Association in all its evangelistic work should seek to get inquirers and converts to press on to full membership in the church of their choice. This seems like a truism; and yet, not from lack of policy but through lack of perspective and through absorption in other things, this vital conclusion has not been pressed as it should be. It is reassuring, however, to notice increasing faithfulness among Association workers in this respect.

In all our work we should seek to strengthen a man's loyalty to his own Christian communion. The charge is made by some that under the influence of

the Association men get a lighter conception of their churchly responsibilities. This ought not to be so.

Next, the Association's policy of religious education should be closely correlated with that of the churches. There should be a thoroughgoing, constructive, far-looking, masterly policy of Christian education reaching from the earliest childhood up to the end of the more formative years.

Every leader of the Young Men's Christian Association should regard himself as a recruiting-officer for the church of Jesus Christ. This should be true not only of the officers but of the members as well. First and foremost should be the attempt to raise up men for the Christian ministry, also for the varied missionary program of the churches. Moreover it is emphatically in the interest of the churches that a certain quota of the choicest men who can be raised up and trained be placed in the leadership of the Association forces. There is nothing to cause great alarm among the pastors of the churches with reference to the small number who have been guided into the secretaryship of the Young Men's Christian Association. In fact, why should the pastors not help the Association to choose these men, and throw the weight of their influence on the side of its calling some of the very best qualified men into the secretaryship? If this were done, would not the solution of all the other problems be greatly hastened? The main work in the Association in recruiting, however, ought to be

to provide a worthy succession for the ministers of to-day, and to fill the gaps, of which there are still so many, in the ministry, and to save from strain and possible breakdown so many men now in the ministry. In the same way the Young Men's Christian Association workers ought to be recruiting-officers for all the foreign mission boards. The principal factor now in influencing college men to enter the missionary service is the Student Volunteer Movement, which on the mission side is the missionary department of the college Associations. Association recruiting ought also to send thousands of the strongest young men into the lay activities of the churches.

In large measure the secretaries have been doing this. One Association worker in his Bible class in twenty years led thirty-one men into the Christian ministry. There is not an Association secretary who ought not to have to his credit the leading of at least one man a year into the Christian ministry.

The Young Men's Christian Association must be maintained as an essentially religious, pronouncedly Christian, and aggressively evangelistic and missionary movement. There is nothing that will so quickly dissolve difficulties, or, to change the figure, create the right atmosphere of understanding and a disposition to do the right thing, as absorption in the great mission of making Christ known to men in such a way that they will obey him. Then everything else will be seen in proper proportion.

To this end more attention must be given to the leadership of the Young Men's Christian Association. It sometimes seems as if the Young Men's Christian Association had but reached the blueprint stage. Far stronger men must be called to its leadership for the next generation, far stronger men than in the past. Some men now in the work must be superseded by men more completely equipped, from the point of view especially of the Church of Christ.

The leaders of the Association ought to give more continuous study to the Church of Christ—to its history and heritage, to its distinctive mission, to its inner working, to its plans, policies, and needs. It should be counted a poor year in which one had not read some of the best new books on church history and on leaders of the churches, not to mention books about the application of the program of Christianity to present-day conditions. Thus points of contact with the other leaders of the Church of Christ might be multiplied, and one might be received more fully into this wonderful fellowship. The reflex influence on the Association movement would be profound.

The church and Association leaders must put their heads together, as well as unite their hearts, that they may define more clearly than has thus far been done the distinctively denominational relation with reference to men and boys of to-day, and the interdenominational relation. There has been much

confused thinking on this subject and a great lack of thinking. In some places leaders of the churches appear to be unconsciously proceeding to set up new interdenominational arrangements, when they have in the Young Men's Christian Association an organization which they have already created, and which ought to be serving them. Yet they proceed to set up new duplicating machinery with the resulting waste of money, time, and supervision, and an inevitable multiplication of friction points. The change that has come over church life as well as that of the Associations in recent years necessitates redefining, restating, and reasserting the distinctive responsibilities of both agencies.

The interdenominational character of the Young Men's Christian Association movement should be maintained. The fact should be emphasized that there is all the difference in the world between an interdenominational movement and an undenominational movement. An undenominational movement is one in which all the members reduce themselves to the lowest common denominator. An interdenominational movement is one with vastly more power and richness; namely, a movement into which each brings that which is most distinctive. The reason why church members value that which is distinctive to them is not because it is theirs, but because they honestly believe it is the truth. What a mistake it is for Associations, which link together loyal members of all of the churches, to stand,

either tacitly or actively, for a policy that would obscure anything distinctive and precious to any body of people who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ!

Every Association man should stand for coöperation among the churches of Jesus Christ. The Association movement is in some ways the most appealing illustration of the advantages of getting together.

The greatest contributions the Young Men's Christian Association has made to the churches may perhaps be indicated as follows. It has called out a great additional lay force, at the time of times in the history of the church, and has placed it with increasing effect at the disposal of the churches. It has influenced men to stir up the gift that was in them, to realize their latent energies, and to relate these in turn to the plans of the Kingdom. The Young Men's Christian Association has brought about a united impact of the most active members of all the churches, in a given community, upon united indifference, united sinfulness, united unbelief, and united opposition. It has also greatly helped the cause of Christ by pioneering, at the suggestion of the churches, in some fields where the churches could not at first have gone. Again, the Association has served the churches through establishing a half-way house, meeting-place where the finest personalities of the churches and their most vital messages are brought to bear upon young men who at first would

not attend church. The Association has made another notable contribution by working out the fourfold program,—expressed by the more modern symbol of the triangle,—a program which seeks to develop the whole range of a young man's life. One of the most discerning leaders of the churches in Great Britain has said that he looks on this as the most original, distinctive, and important contribution made by the Association to Christianity. The Association has created new groups of specialists, one of which deals with the physical side of the life of man and has already reclaimed vast areas of sport life from influences adverse to the church, and instead has made them tributary to its life. It has also developed specialists on boy life, on certain aspects of education, not to mention others—and has placed all this highly specialized leadership at the disposal of the churches. Another great contribution has been the developing of the community-wide program, the county-wide program, and at times of a nation-wide program—touching a certain class, a whole community, a region, or even the nation.

If this movement will increasingly forget itself, and cultivate not pride of organization but the spirit of service, rendering the maximum of helpfulness, letting credit take care of itself, it will find itself in the larger confidence of the churches, in a more abundant life, and in greater triumphs of faith.

In conclusion it may be suggested that this is a superhuman process, this drawing together of the

leaders of the Christian forces. Jesus Christ was very familiar with the problem of the maladjustment of his followers. He was more concerned about getting his followers to understand one another and love one another (especially when it was difficult, or when they sharply differed, or when they criticized one another, or when ignorance and passion dominated) than about any other one problem. His solution of the problem was strikingly original. He gave himself to prayer. He offered his great high-priestly prayer, at the heart of which was the petition that they all might be one. He proved by act, as well as by precept, that his is a superhuman process; that not until our hearts are flooded with the love of God, shed there by the Holy Ghost, will we cast out selfishness and jealousy, and confess our sins singly and collectively, and go his way.

Therefore with quiet faith we may approach this difficult question, knowing it is very near to the heart of Jesus Christ, and that by his example he will lead us as we follow in his steps.

The men do not live who by their own foresight, ingenuity, and power can unite the hearts, fuse together the convictions, and blend the visions of the great, comprehensive, and resourceful body of the Christian forces of America; but the Lord Jesus Christ can. He is in the habit of doing the things that are impossible with men.

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRY

F. ERNEST JOHNSON

SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION, FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Before organizing his department in the Federal Council, Mr. Johnson spent some years in pastoral work and in the fields of religious education and the training of church workers. He is the author of a number of publications in the general field of applied Christianity and one of the authors of *Christian Ideals in Industry*.

Under his direction the Department of Research and Education has been able to bring the Christian conscience of the country to bear upon industrial problems with which it has been generally assumed that the church and its ministers are not competent to deal. This work has awakened a new social conscience among pastors and church members, and is enabling them to recognize what the true application of Christian principles would mean in industrial relations. The accompanying chapter, therefore, is an expression of Mr. Johnson's central interest—the relation and obligation of the church to industry.

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRY

F. Ernest Johnson

The title of this chapter defines a problem, one that is becoming daily more insistent, and one to which multitudes of people within and without the churches are becoming more and more sensitive. Briefly stated, it is the problem of what the church should teach with reference to the application of ethical principles to industry, and of what the church as an institution should practise in its capacity as capitalist and as an employer of labor. The importance of the employing function of the church has not been generally recognized, but when the number of its employees in office buildings, parish houses, and printing and publishing establishments is considered it becomes evident that the contact of the church with industry is by no means wholly second-hand.

The question here raised is: What is the church doing and saying, and what should it do and say, with reference to the ethical duties involved in industrial relations and with reference to the issues in industrial conflict?

It is comparatively a short time since church

bodies and individual churches began to take an active interest in the questions here stated. Up to the present time the chief feature of church activity in this field has been pronouncements of principles and general resolutions passed by official church bodies, liberal sermons, and articles in the religious press calling for the application of the principles of religion to industrial life. In fact, it might be said that we have been going through the "pronouncement" stage of the process of socializing the thought of the churches with reference to industrial matters. The liberal churchman is tempted to take these pronouncements somewhat too seriously. They have indeed served a very useful educational purpose, and on not a few occasions they have stood the minister well in hand who has found himself on the industrial firing-line and who has appealed to the ethical sanction embodied in some church pronouncement but for which his fight for what he regarded as industrial justice would have been a forlorn hope. Unquestionably the so-called "social creed of the churches," promulgated by the Federal Council of Churches and adopted in substance by several of the leading denominations, has furnished the basis of much liberal preaching and teaching. It is no trifle that great denominations and representative religious organizations have formally gone on record as committed to the principle of a "living wage as a first charge upon industry," for the unrestricted right to organize and to bargain collectively, and

for a democratic form of industrial control. Not the least result of these pronouncements has been the building up of sympathetic contacts between the churches and industrial workers, who often regard the churches as having sympathy chiefly with capitalistic groups.

It has begun to appear to many, however, that the value of pronouncements in themselves is not so great as we have assumed and that they represent a stage of development out of which the churches should now pass into fields of more constructive educational activity. Many persons, both within the churches and outside them, have come to suspect not only that these liberal pronouncements are without any great concrete significance but that they sometimes actually serve as an alibi, or, to use a more dignified synonym, a "compensation" for the lack of any energetic and courageous activity when a real issue is on. It may perhaps also be said that these various pronouncements of church bodies have served their purpose in bringing vital issues home to the conscience of the church and in winning for the pulpit and the religious press the recognized right to deal with questions of this kind. I had an illustration of this fact when, in conversation with a prominent chamber of commerce official, he said to me: "I am quite reconciled to the fact that the ministers are going to preach about industrial questions. I am not sure that it is wise for them to do so, but the fact is that the people demand it. All I ask,

therefore, is that the minister, when he speaks on industry, shall know what he is talking about."

The time has surely come for the pulpit, the religious press, and the class-room of religious instruction to demonstrate whether there was any vitality or validity in the admirable pronouncements that have been formulated during the last twenty years. A group of labor officials in a Middle-Western city recently said to some socially minded church leaders that they could not become very much interested in the liberal pronouncements of the churches about collective bargaining and the right to organize so long as in their building operations and their printing projects the churches continued to employ almost entirely non-union labor. It has happened again and again when an issue has been joined locally that the churches have been called upon to demonstrate the convictions expressed by their national bodies, and nothing has happened. A prominent church official said to me recently, "I am about ready to ask my communion either to put in practice some of its liberal pronouncements or to repeal them."

In other words, with all respect and with no want of appreciation of what has been accomplished, one may truthfully say, speaking in the vernacular, that the time has come for church bodies and agencies to "put up or shut up" with reference to the problems of industry. The disparity between utterance and performance is, of course, due largely to the fact that utterances commonly come from parliamentary

bodies which meet only occasionally while the situations calling for specific concrete action are encountered only by local church units. Another way, therefore, of expressing the need of the present hour would be to say that we must effect a closer harmony between those agencies of the church which are responsible for doctrine and the individual congregations which are responsible for practice.

As to those forms of service with reference to industry which have thus far been developed in at least a minor degree, I should like to group my comments under three heads: investigation, teaching and preaching, and the ministry of reconciliation.

1. *Investigation.*—I begin with this subject not because it is most important but because it is in its nature prior to the others. In the last few years a number of researches have been undertaken under religious auspices, some of them joint inquiries by Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish bodies, into the ethical aspects of industrial controversy. Some of these studies have had little visible result; others have apparently contributed much toward an ultimate abatement of unquestioned evils. In any case, they have brought to light important facts and have interpreted typical situations, thus furnishing "case material" for the study of industrial relations.

There is good reason to believe, however, that most of the studies hitherto made have been so exclusively directed at critical and abnormal situations in industrial life that they have not yielded as much

as might have been hoped by way of illuminating the ordinary and normal relationships between employer and employee. They have often showed what was wrong at a time when it was too late to do anything about it. What is needed now is not so much studies of critical conflict situations which have issued in an actual break of coöperative relationship as studies of day-to-day conditions that will illuminate the problem of developing a technique for maintaining continuous, constructive, wholesome relations in industry. There are many such situations which church agencies may profitably study, provided always when technical problems are encountered technicians are called in to deal with them. Here is an immeasurable opportunity for coöperative service on the part of the churches.

Another phase of this research function arises out of the fact that even where questions at issue have no immediate and direct ethical significance it frequently happens that the sources of information are so obscured and discussion of the questions is so prejudiced that church agencies furnish almost the only available instrumentality for securing and reporting accurate information. There are economic questions having to do with investment and profit in basic industries and public services which society should normally have ample facilities for answering authoritatively which are totally obscured in a mass of contradictory propaganda. The time has come when many ministers and religious editors have de-

spaired of getting reliable information on questions of this character and are calling upon church agencies for information.

2. *Teaching and Preaching.*—I prefer to discuss these functions together because preaching is in reality a form of teaching. The sermon has its special character and the pulpit its own criteria of effectiveness, but unless preaching fits definitely into an educational program it is of little permanent value.

There is no use in disguising the fact that preaching is on the defensive to-day, not only because of the highly specialized character of all knowledge, which puts a terrific strain upon the preacher's resources in intelligence and skill, but also because of the great vogue of discussion and the tendency to regard preaching, especially where controversial social issues are involved, as one-sided, dogmatic, unsatisfactory, and ineffectual. As one who believes thoroughly in the new technique of discussion, I want to register my conviction of the validity and the indispensability of preaching. The wise preacher of social and industrial righteousness does not merely utter pronouncements. He is not content to read the socially "unregenerate" person out of the church; he puts forth all his skill to keep him in the church and within hearing of his message. He feels deeply as did St. Paul, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel"; but he does not insist on delivering the whole of his gospel in a single discourse. He is a

prophet, but he is also a teacher. He wins by reason and compels by the clarity of his own vision and the force of his own conviction and loyalty.

It is quite gratuitous to assume that because the church and the church school are becoming committed to democratic methods, there is no place for the enunciation of principles, the putting forth of ideals in a frankly earnest and challenging way. No amount of reasoning and discussion can take the place of a challenge that precipitates a moral judgment, or a declaration of ideals that by the force of their own excellence give birth to new loyalties. The requirements of democracy and good pedagogy are met when the words of the pulpit fall continually and systematically under review in forum and classroom as part of an orderly educational process.

But can an honest and courageous, socially minded preacher keep his pulpit? Fear on this score is keeping many promising young men out of the ministry. Are they right? Unquestionably a man of prophetic mold will find some pulpits too cramping for his conscience. If his congregation, not content with maintaining its own freedom, denies the preacher his liberty of utterance, the prophet must take his departure. But, broadly speaking, when a prophetic preacher loses his church it is likely to be his own fault, or at least the fault of his method, quite as much as the fault of his congregation.

Years ago I confided my own anxiety over this matter to the late Bishop Williams, and he told me

of his own experience in maintaining freedom of utterance through a long ministry. He referred to it playfully as a special dispensation of Providence, but any one who knew Bishop Williams could well understand it. He had vision and courage, but he had charity and an affectionate respect for his fellow-men.

In any case, the preacher who has a strong pastoral consciousness, who feels the burden of his "cure of souls," will take a great deal of punishment and suffer many a blow to his personal pride before he voluntarily retires from a conservative parish. And if an impasse is finally reached, the strategy of the situation is not to be overlooked: there is vastly more impetus in an expulsion than in a resignation!

The possibilities of the class-room of religious education in the matter of industrial justice and economic reconstruction have only begun to be realized. The impact of modern educational theory and method is now being felt by the church, and a new spirit of inquiry is developing. Young people are asking: what does Christianity, what does Judaism, mean in terms of our modern economic life? Courses of study are being introduced bearing such titles as "Christianity and Economic Problems." Forums and discussion groups are studying the ethics of industrial relations, the spiritual significance of the labor movement, and the application of the Golden Rule to industry.

The religious press is entering upon a new phase of influence, and is fast becoming a medium of fact and experience which inevitably brings the churches into the arena of industrial conflict and makes them a factor in shaping industrial events.

Back of the church and the religious press, furnishing facts and analyzing issues, are such agencies as the *Inquiry,* with its Commission on Industrial Relations, the social service departments of several great denominations, and the Federal Council of Churches. The National Catholic Welfare Conference is performing a like function for its own constituency, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis is taking steps to develop a similar service. Thus both facts and educational technique are being put at the disposal of the churches.

The movement is being accelerated by the influx into the ministry of preachers and directors of religious education who have been trained in theological schools where the courses in social ethics now include an intensive study of industrial problems. The spirit of this new approach is scientific, tolerant, and constructive. The most conservative elements in our industrial society may well look upon it with satisfaction. Its aim is reconstruction, surely, but not destruction.

3. *The Ministry of Reconciliation.*—The church is ideally an inclusive fellowship. It includes representatives of both over-privileged and under-privileged classes, even while opposing all special

privilege as a denial of brotherhood. In its fellowship an "atmosphere" should be developed in which conflicts are resolved and understanding and coöperation steadily increased. The church which has in its membership representatives of economic groups that find themselves in conflict faces the supreme test of its power. The distinctive thing about the church is fellowship, and a fellowship worth the name should be solvent for the most serious animosities.

The chief test of this fellowship comes when industrial strife breaks out in the community. The temptation that comes to the minister and the lay leadership at such a time is to preserve quiet and order by ignoring the conflict; in Biblical paraphrase, to keep the form of fellowship but to deny the power thereof. This is at once innocuous and cowardly. Fellowship must be maintained, not *in spite* of a clash of interest, but *in* and *through* it. The church should furnish the auspices under which differences can be freely faced and discussed and animosities resolved. The program of industrial relations conferences developed by the Social Service Commission of the Federal Council of Churches is a move in this direction. It is being carried on with the cooperation of denominational social service agencies and the city and state church federations. Little by little, a technique of fellowship and reconciliation in industrial relations is being developed which promises to make possible a new and important ministry on the part of organized religion.

THE IMMIGRANT

EDWARD A. STEINER

PROFESSOR OF APPLIED CHRISTIANITY, GRINNELL COLLEGE

Dr. Steiner is widely known among all those, both here and abroad, who are interested in the vexing problem of racial relationships, as one who has acquired a broad and sympathetic understanding both through his own personal experiences and through his lifelong study. Born in a small town in Slovakia in 1866, he spent his early years in Vienna and shared with others of the masses the hardships of an oppressed race. Throughout his youth he carried the hope that he might some day live in the free land of America. Graduating from the University of Heidelberg in 1885, he came to this country in the steerage and embarked upon a period of struggle in which he experienced the poverty and discouragement known to many thousands of immigrants. Spurred on by his great desire for education, however, he received a degree from Oberlin College in 1891 and pursued graduate work at Göttingen and Berlin. The next twelve years he spent in the Congregational ministry, until in 1903 he was appointed professor of applied Christianity in Grinnell College, where he is now serving. He has written a number of books devoted chiefly to furthering the ideal of brotherhood and interracial sympathy and understanding.

As all his readers will realize, the inspiring purpose in Dr. Steiner's work has been to prevent the disillusionment of so many of our new-comers, not only for their sakes, but so that the nation itself may not suffer from the crumbling of their ideal of America. He has followed the course of immigration, both by an intensive study of it in this country, and by frequent returns to his native land. Christianity has meant to him the expression of love and sympathy throughout our ideals and attitudes. It is his hope that this force will bridge the barrier now existing between our many races and replace it by mutual fellowship and good-will.

THE IMMIGRANT

EDWARD A. STEINER

The non-English-speaking non-Germanic people of Europe have finished their trekking to the United States in those alarming numbers which made them a problem by virtue of mass if not of quality. In the half-century which marks the migration of these aliens, great changes have occurred. Empires from which they came have been dissolved. Their great cities have fallen into slow decay. Dynasties have vanished, and world power has shifted from the Old World to the New. This has come about as dramatically and swiftly as if geological upheavals and climatic changes, by their incalculable play with the fortunes of humanity, had forced mankind into new adjustments.

Fifty years ago America was young and most of its soil was virgin, while Europe was a vast and costly cemetery in which young men slept with the stilled dreams of Vaterland and La Patrie, and from which the living escaped across the Atlantic. Commerce and industry, and the cities which were to be born of their wedlock, were in their infancy,

while agriculture was calling the Americans westward, and their kindred from the north of Europe to follow their adventurous pioneering to finish with slow patient labor what they had so impatiently begun.

The nation was young politically, the walls of national consciousness were low, the great sons to whom she had given birth—George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln—reached high above their fellows and became world figures, their name and fame luring men from the Old World, where nationalism was already a cult, compelling conformity to language and faith.

Biologically the race was young, and scarcely race-conscious beyond its color. To be created in the image of the Nordics was not yet as equivalent to being created in the image of God. The doors of Castle Garden were wide open. "Whosoever will may come," was proclaimed to the economically depressed and the politically oppressed, all over the world. The intelligence test had not yet been invented, and it was still self-evident that "all men are created equal"—and that they had certain inalienable rights.

If America was young industrially, politically, and biologically, she was old or growing older spiritually. Protestantism with the exception of certain untamed sects was going the way of all religious movements when they are far removed from their origin or from some period of vitalizing renewal. The Metho-

dist circuit-rider was finishing his militant rounds among the outlying settlements. The great revivals with their intense emotional appeal for a rebirth were losing their spontaneous force and were growing more and more artificial.

Dwight L. Moody had many imitators but no successors. Billy Sunday made his spectacular change from the baseball diamond to the Sawdust Trail, making revivals a popular sport for a season, and often leaving behind him a spiritual nostalgia. Conversions were registered by signing a name on a card; additions to the church came by invitation and competition between pastors of rival denominations; but the zeal for numbers was not always a zeal for souls. Church extension was called home missions and preceded the era of filling-stations and garages.

Foreign missions absorbed the converting passion of the church; the romance of the Christian conquest of the world was still colorful and vivid; large numbers of idealistic college men and women gave themselves to this glorious task of bringing the gospel of salvation to heathen nations, but when the heathen appeared as immigrants they became a serious problem.

The churches were either unconscious of the new pressure of souls upon them, or they regarded themselves as helpless before this moving mass of humans, which came with ancient faiths, strange folkways, and alien speech. They took flight before the army of aliens bravely singing "Onward, Christian sol-

diers, marching" to the suburbs, and the home boards built anemic-looking mission chapels and manned them with ministers to match.

The problem was not an easy one to solve. Had the church been young, vital, resourceful, self-sacrificial, and prophetic, it might have found a way; but even then it would have been a very difficult task.

The very variety of the human material made the task difficult, while its mass made it formidable and forbidding.

The Italians who bulked so large in the new population were Roman Catholics by long traditions, by cultural inclination and temperament. They were poorly shepherded by their own church; vast numbers of the men were neglecting church attendance or were openly hostile. The cities which held them in their slums had no understanding of the social problem they presented. The criminal element among them found fertile soil in which to grow. Certain vices flourished, while against others the traditional virtues held; the home, such as it was, did not disintegrate, and divorce as well as prostitution were practically unknown.

Proselytism among them was begun by converted Catholics of their own nationality, whose chief gospel too often was a reviling of the mother-church. Small groups were gathered and held together; many were repelled or driven closer to the bosom of their church by the natural defense under attack.

Moreover the Protestant faith required an intellectual assent and a spiritual rebirth, for which they had no understanding or inclination.

The Protestant Church in America is practical within a narrow range. It wants immediate results. It gave little or no time to the study of the problem or for the careful preparation of men for this difficult task. When statistics failed, support failed; many Italian mission churches were closed. A few are flourishing, and some are languishing.

Social settlements connected with missions were usually successful. The Italians had many children, many needs, and a social and responsive nature; so that the social workers had plenty to do, even if the preachers faced empty pews.

Had the Protestant Church possessed foresight and patience it might have made an honest and genuine appeal to the large number of Italians who were Catholic in name only and not yet so materialistic as to be hardened to a spiritual appeal. As it was it did stimulate the Catholic Church to more genuine and personal interest in the Italian immigrant, who needed much more than the holy sacraments to fit him into the new and strange life in this virile and more trying environment.

The Slavic immigrants were much more varied culturally and linguistically than the Italians, but were as a whole more responsive to whatever effort was made in their behalf by the Protestant Church. They

knew of Protestantism either as an experience in their own lives or in that of their neighbors, and were neither alien nor antagonistic toward it.

Naturally all the Slavic groups touched by the American Protestant churches are progressive and American—facts which have not endeared this work to the priests, who sense danger to their flocks and have thrown around them all possible protection. On the whole the Roman Catholic Church has profited rather than lost by the unwelcome competition for the souls of its Slavic children; for in spite of its age it is adaptable, and it has become so American that it probably will not produce saints on this side of the Atlantic. It may produce men of affairs, and if these affairs include a vision of a better America, there need be no quarrel over the results.

The Jewish mass immigration to the United States already has been the most significant event in Israel since the first exodus. Numbers and orthodoxy have not only given it power which it never possessed before, but a long lease of life against all the possible disintegrating influences of this New World. The conversion of the Jewish immigrant appealed especially to the premillenarian type of Christian who cannot envisage the second coming of the Christ without the consent of the Jews. There are Jewish missions keyed to a less miraculous expectation, and some of them are content to minister to needy Jews both materially and spiritually, without expecting the hostage of their souls.

Some of these missions are not even worthy of the contempt heaped upon them by the rabbis; others may be unselfish and devoted enough not to deserve it, or to be conscious of it. American Protestants are less and less inclined to be worried about the salvation of souls, particularly of Jewish souls.

At best if they support missions to the Jews they may expect a favorable spiritual reaction upon a sterile Jewish orthodoxy or a quickening of the religious spirit among the masses of American Jews—to whom Judaism is only a race name or a caste, and religion merely a once-a-year interruption of business on the Day of Atonement.

On the whole one might adversely judge the attempt of the American Protestant Church to minister adequately to the masses of non-English-speaking immigrants. It began its work too late and in haste, under the stimulus of fear. This led to waste in money, men, and emotions. It had too little understanding of the people who made up the problem; too little understanding perhaps of religion itself.

A successful mission to other peoples presupposes an overflowing spiritual life and a consuming desire to share it. The Protestant Church regarded herself at best as a spiritual policeman, to make law and order imperative if not attractive. During the war she became an arm of the State; after the war she attempted to bring salvation by way of Americanization, and when missionaries introduced their converts as one hundred per cent. American the congre-

gation sang "The Star-Spangled Banner" as a doxology.

Yet so much faithful unselfish work was done by churches and missionaries that criticism is silenced, especially as it comes too late.

A Christian cannot look upon proselyting as insolence, provided it is done in an apostolic spirit, with understanding, discretion, and zeal. If mistakes are made it is still better than a dormant church which does nothing but exist.

American Protestantism has given much to Catholicism through its missions, poorly as they were conceived and badly as they were often conducted. Protestantism might gain equally by an ardent persistent Catholic mission to its heretical children.

While Jews have always taken care of their poor, there is no doubt that missionaries, the Y.M.C.A., and the Y.W.C.A. have made them realize that there were greater needs than financial ones which should be met. Besides the churches through their missions, the Y.M.C.A. and especially the Y.W.C.A have done helpful service which has borne much good fruit.

The International Institute under the auspices of the Y.W.C.A. is perhaps the most significant work done in behalf of immigrant women. It has brought to its work understanding, sympathy, and zeal, tempered by tact. It is no doubt true, however, if one might view the work done by the Prot-

estant Church as a whole, that there is now because of it a better understanding between the non-English-speaking immigrants and their new environment, and especially a better understanding of the immigrant by his American neighbors; and this ought to justify the labor and the money spent upon the task.

It has also stimulated the older communions to do that sort of practical work for the foreign-born which is the genius of American Protestantism; it has helped many transplanted churches to make the transition from being part of a great state-supported system to being self-supporting and self-determined.

The work of these churches has given to many foreigners a glimpse of the best expression of American life, when normally they would have known only the worst; and to the degree that American Protestant churches become more truly democratic, more spiritually stimulating and socially effective, to that degree their missions to the foreign-born will succeed—and finally become unnecessary.

As contrasted with what has been done, consider for a moment what might be done by organized Christianity if it had the will and the technique.

The church which cares to attract immigrants needs to have dignity if not beauty. When the immigrant goes to church he expects to meet God, not the minister or the hand-shaking committee.

The church music that he appreciates is neither jazz nor grand opera, but genuine church music. If he does not understand all the sermon, he does know the difference between levity and seriousness.

Outside the church he appreciates a friendly greeting. If it is in his own tongue, so much the better. Even an American can easily learn half a dozen different ways of saying, "How do you do."

Sunday-school classes for foreigners are possible, and can be used to increase not only friendly contact and the use of the English language, but to explain the American way of looking at God and his world.

The church may help the immigrant groups to honor their own national heroes without detracting from the glory of our George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

Classes in Americanization, which pave the way to the more and more exacting examinations for citizenship, are a boon and may serve to show how ignorant the average American is of civics.

Receptions for foreigners who have obtained their citizenship papers may be made gala occasions, provided the speeches are not too long, and a little less than one hundred per cent. American. The immigrant likes to feel that he still has a right to love his country, though he has forsworn allegiance to its government.

Exhibits of Old World handicraft stimulate the pride of the immigrant, and increase the respect

of Americans for people who do not buy everything ready-made, and never buy on the instalment plan.

Performances of folk dances and concerts of national music may help to take the conceit out of those Americans who like jazz, and who when they want music turn on the radio.

Churches in localities where immigrants are numerous might maintain an information bureau; for these strangers are perplexed and too often fall into the hands of exploiters, who not infrequently are of their own nationality.

Lectures will be well attended by Jews, some Italians and Slavs, provided they are serious, yet lucid, and, if possible—free.

Clubs are providential institutions. They serve to develop self-control and the training for self-government. Americans have a genius in organizing them; to stay by them and make them worth while is more difficult. Of course classes in almost anything are good, especially in English—unless the public schools provide them—their teaching is usually better.

The minister, if he is not too self-righteous, may visit the jail, where he will often find foreigners who are innocent; and even if they are guilty they need a friend. The chances are that they were ignorant of the law.

The minister ought also to know where the immigrants live and how. Their dirty tumbledown houses

are usually owned by Americans, who do nothing except collect the high rents.

When the minister preaches about home missions and tries to increase the collections, it is best that he should know what he is talking about. The immigrant problem cannot be interpreted by statistics. Statistics themselves need to be interpreted. It is best for him not to say that every immigrant is either a potential Bolshevik—or a coming Michelangelo or Raphael. He is usually an undeveloped human being, useful because he labors, dangerous when he is neglected or exploited, and worth while because he is a soul.

There are no rules and regulations by which immigrants can be made into Christians and good citizens; a living example is worth ten books on civics, and worth more than a ton of tracts. You can "get" the whole gang if you make a friend of its leader, and sometimes you may have to fight the leader, for he leads the game astray.

A rule which is easy to test is, that to the degree that one helpfully serves racial or national groups, to that degree one learns to love them; and to the degree that one hurts them, to that degree one hates them. Missionaries rarely speak ill of their charges; merchants often do.

It is wise not to use immigrants as Exhibit A or B. If they are sensitive it may hurt them, and if they are brazen they ought not to be exhibited.

The immigrant who makes a living by talking

about his people, who depreciates their virtues and exposes their faults, is either an ingrate or an ignoramus.

The best work for immigrants is usually done when one expects nothing immediately tangible in return, not even statistics.

THE LOCAL JAIL

CHARLES N. LATHROP

Executive Secretary of the Social Service Department, National Council of the Episcopal Church

Mr. Lathrop is a native of California, having been born in San Francisco. After graduating from Harvard in 1896 and from the Western Theological Seminary in 1899, he became rector of the Episcopal Church of the Advent in his native city.

In the exciting days in San Francisco after the fire of 1906, Mr. Lathrop was an active leader in the reform movements which resulted in the cleaning up of the city, and was especially prominent in practical work among the youth, his efforts resulting in the issuance of an order by President Roosevelt, his close friend, by which young boys were forbidden to deliver special delivery letters after nightfall. Another important reform in which he was instrumental was in securing the enactment of laws by the California legislature abolishing the night employment of children.

Before the entrance of the United States into the World War, Mr. Lathrop represented the American Commission for Relief in Belgium, returning in 1916 to become dean of All Saints' Cathedral, Milwaukee.

In 1920 he took charge of the Department of Social Service of the Episcopal Church. In this work he has successfully undertaken the difficult task of organizing the dioceses of the church for social service. The department under his direction has in very considerable measure socialized the thinking of the Episcopal Church. Its annual conference, held in conjunction with the National Conference of Social Work, is always a noteworthy feature of that great gathering. Together with the development of interest in the various community relationships of the church, Dean Lathrop has maintained a courageous attitude toward such controversial questions as the relation of the church to industry and the defense of civil liberties.

THE LOCAL JAIL

CHARLES N. LATHROP

In this article I deal with the local jail only. This means the county jail and the city or village lock-up. I am dealing with them because they are within easy reach of people who read this article, because contact can easily be made with any one of these institutions; but especially because the local jail is a forgotten, neglected, forlorn, important institution of the State.

Our country inherited the local jails from England. About fifty years ago, England abolished them and set up in their stead a comparatively small number of institutions under the direct management of the home secretary. Our local jails have continued with little or no improvement to reproduce the same old abuses that for more than a century outraged human nature, and finally drove the English to abolish them.

These jails resist improvement, partly because nobody pays any attention to them, nobody cares, but mainly because they are the centuries-old remuneration for political activity, an important

pocket of the patronage system. In many places, the jails are supported by payment to the sheriff or jailer of a per capita amount. He pockets what is left after feeding his prisoners. And it pays. In Richmond, Virginia, for instance, the jailer has in some years made double the salary of the governor of the State. Disturb the local jail, and it is like stepping on the tail of a dog. The shock stirs repercussions in the whole system in most unexpected and surprising ways. The State Board of Charities of one of our States once exercised its veto power over some county appointments. The last report of the results was the suggestion from some "one-hundred per cent. American" semi-political organization in the State that lynching was too good for the secretary. It took all the power of good citizens—ordinarily not interested in politics—to save the board from immediate slaughter.

There were, in the year 1923, 319,908 prisoners sentenced for crime [1] to the jails. Taking the United States as a whole, only a little more than half of the men and women held in the local jail are sentenced prisoners. The rest are men charged with crime and awaiting trial, or men (and women) held as material witnesses for some case coming to trial in the future. We can say, therefore, that there were approximately 600,000 men in the county jails of the United States during 1923. How many were in the

[1] United States Census Report on Prisoners, Department of Commerce, 1923.

lock-ups of the city, town, and village? Nobody knows. Dr. Hastings H. Hart, consultant in delinquency and penology of the Russell Sage Foundation considers 900,000 "a very moderate estimate for the number of prisoners in lock-ups and police stations." It is obvious, then, that the local jail in the United States holds a critical place in the whole problem of crime and punishment.

Furthermore the local jail as a reformative institution has a greater opportunity than any other State institution. To this jail comes every person charged with crime. Every young man, the first time he has ever been in jail, ever been accused by the State, lands in the city or county jail. He hears the steel door clang and realizes that for the first time in his life he has lost his liberty. Certainly at this juncture the State, the church, every reformative organization of the community, ought to bring its influence to bear to reëstablish this young man in his proper social life. He needs help, and he knows it.

Apparently, however, nobody else knows it. When he hears the steel door slam behind him, he wakens to the realization that he has a dozen, more or less, companions. He has been thrown into a gangway, which is the walk between cells (three or four on either side), all together holding some twelve or fourteen men. The cells are placed inside a building, so that there is a wide space between the cell-block and the wall where the windows are. Consequently the gangway where he is has no natural

light. It is lighted always by artificial light. It has no immediate outlet of fresh air. The group is apt to be the offscouring of the city streets. They have nothing to do except to sit on the floor and play cards and swap stories; and the boy for the first time put in jail, day and night, day after day, with no one else excepting this group to meet and talk to, naturally develops a feeling of loyalty to these men in the same position with him. They make a solid group. All the rest of the world is cut away. All that is left for him is the group of men in his gangway. And the companionship is not for a few hours; it is for day after day, with no direct sunlight, with no outside fresh air, with nothing to do, with no exercise, often for months at a time. Can any system be more fitted to make a criminal class? And we remember that over a million people every year are held in our lock-ups and county jails, and carry away what they learn there.

We remember too that about half of the men who are there are in the eyes of the law innocent; and a goodly proportion actually innocent. And another group is made up of witnesses who are entirely free of crime or charge of crime, whose only misfortune is a poverty too extreme to supply a needful bond. A third group are the insane awaiting examination or held till an opening makes room for them in the state institution. We remember too that the average jail is vermin-infested, that the ordinary local jail gives to the material witness as to

anybody else the blankets left by the last occupant unwashed and unfumigated, and that the compulsory resident buys his own soap and towel or goes without. We have the beginning of a picture that for social stupidity and short-sightedness is without equal in the modern world. Out of this system comes the criminal class—criminals in many cases devoted and loyal together—because only in this group have they found the normal human satisfactions they crave and need.

This group has been deliberately created by every arrangement offered by the county jail. There could be no more effective social wave of activity, nothing more calculated to overcome the so-called "crime wave," than the nation-wide activity of local citizens for the care of the men in the local jails.

The method for meeting the problem of the jail is so simple as to seem foolish to write. The great need for the man in jail is a personal contact with a good man. I mean by a good man a man who has the pastoral heart—a real love of souls—and who is a success in his life. The boy needs a man to whom he can look up, and who has a heart sufficiently tender to make a human approach and real friendship possible. Such men are certainly not unknown in Christian churches.

In my judgment, all that is necessary is for the clergyman to give some little attention to the local jail and then to get one of his men, or a group of men, interested. The next step is a satisfactory con-

tact with the authorities in charge of the jail. They are ordinarily badgered by groups like the Holy Rollers for permission for services. Most of them will be entirely coöperative as soon as they are convinced that they are dealing with ordinarily competent, intelligent people, who want personal contact with individuals more than public services. It may easily happen that the large number of prisoners coming and going make too numerous a group for such a committee to undertake to care for all the prisoners. They may then select the particular groups for which they feel special responsibility. This can be accomplished by an arrangement with the jailer in charge of the listing of the men as they are entered, to write on a post-card, already addressed to some member of the group, the name and the date of admission of each prisoner that falls into the group. For instance, if any one claims to be a first offender, he ought to receive special attention from the group. Then let the jailer or his clerk jot down on a post-card the name of the man. One can then easily arrange an interview. In a New England town the churches acting together employ a social worker at the local jail, to be the big brother to the men who need him, to be the link between them and those who live in the outside world, and to create the necessary contacts for them when they go out.

Besides this Big Brother work, there is the responsibility of the community to provide a decent

jail for its prisoners. As the men get into work as big brothers, they naturally will be learning more and more about the conditions of the local jail and ought to be getting clear in their minds what changes ought to come to make their jail a decent place to keep human beings in. The chance may often open to improve conditions. Of course it is unfair for one who gets permission to visit in the jail immediately to turn in criticism on the keeper who gave the permission. The most hopeless method is the method of sensational publicity. If a jail does not give what men ought to have, the fault rests probably ultimately on the community itself, and the only way to correct the failure is to develop a better attitude on the part of the community, so that the community will insist upon decent conditions in their jail. Merely to "clean up" a jail is like running a stick through a mud puddle: the water closes very quickly behind it.

Improvements in the conditions of the jail should therefore be made in association with the sheriff and the jailer. The local jail could easily be made an interesting project study for a group of men. There are some simple practical books on the subject. Any lawyer could very easily make a study of the laws that have to do with the maintenance of the local jail, how the men employed in it are appointed, and how the sheriff gets his pay; also whether there is a committee of inspection, the State Board of Charities, the State Prison Commission, or some parallel

organization, which has the right to inspect and make recommendations. Have they too the power to enforce their recommendations?

After hearing the lawyer's report on these laws, the group will probably be interested to have a representative from the State Board of Charities or whatever organization has the responsibility of inspection and criticism, invited to talk the subject over with them. Probably a printed report from this commission can be obtained and may be read and discussed by the group.

At another meeting the sheriff or other officer responsible for management of the jail ought to be invited to confer with the group. Questions like the following could well be asked him: How many of the inmates are people awaiting trial? Are there any held as witnesses? How many are convicted misdemeanants? How many altogether? How many cells are there in the jail? Is it fire-proof? How many years ago was it built? How much money is allowed per capita for the care of the prisoners? What is the daily dietary? Are there any children in the jail? Has the jail a hospital ward? Are all prisoners given medical examination immediately after commitment? Are prisoners in an infectious condition isolated from other prisoners? How often does the jail physician visit the jail? Is the jail physician paid a salary? Are all prisoners required to bathe when first committed? Are clean blankets given each prisoner when first committed? Has the

jail flush toilets? Is the jailer paid a regular salary, or does he get his pay by fees? Is there a system of parole? Do the inmates have regular employment? How many hours do they pass in their cells? How many hours together? How many hours at work? Are there any women in the jail? If so, is there a woman in charge of them? Are they employed?

In undertaking this study and in asking these questions, it ought to be made evident to the sheriff as well as to the group that there is no muck-raking motive, no desire to find fault or blame anybody. We want only to know the facts. We have a right and duty as citizens to know them. If conditions are not ideal, the fault rests primarily, not with the one in charge, but with the system itself. A jailer cannot make a good jail out of a bad one, or an effective administration with no money. Even though one should feel a jailer quite unfitted for his position, the fact that he has the position rests rather with the official who has the power of appointment.

But we need to think further. Our purpose is primarily to study the system, and, if there is some possible improvement, to try to effect that improvement. We want not so much to whitewash cells or wash the bedding, as to develop in our community a public opinion that will insist that the cells and bedding be permanently cleaned, and the jail made permanently fit for its purpose. We want to work if possible in harmonious coöperation with those charged with the administration of the jail, asking

from them suggestions as to what they need and in what way we can be of assistance to them.

We have a right to expect from a jail: (1) that the men and women be occupied at useful work; (2) that substantial compensation be given for work done, for the benefit of man and family; (3) that the jail be clean, and that the men and women have the chance to keep clean themselves; (4) that the inmates get wholesome food; (5) that women have a woman in charge of them; (6) that adequate medical service be provided; (7) that on entering the jail the inmate have medical and mental examination; (8) that the jail be a place not injurious to health; (9) that good reading matter be provided.

I have made no effort to suggest a way out, because there is no way out until public opinion in each community compels that community to accept its responsibilities and to give to its local jail the attention that jail justly deserves. Up to to-day every effort to bring this attention has failed. The improvement in the city and county jail in the last fifty years is hardly noticeable. It is too slight to count. The large proportion of our local jails are worse to-day than they were fifty years ago. Only here and there has there been improvement.

This article is really a cry in despair. No one else has been willing to pay any attention to the local jail. Will the churches? Is there anything in our Lord's command?

That will depend upon the action of the man who reads this article. I shall be glad to give suggestions or help to those who will begin this work in their communities.

MINISTERING TO THE HANDICAPPED

RICHARD C. CABOT

PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL MEDICINE AND SOCIAL ETHICS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Dr. Cabot is probably the only medical authority in the country who is also a leader in social work and a professor of social ethics. He was the first to see the imperative necessity of social work in the public hospital, and he pioneered in the creation of a social service department in the Massachusetts General Hospital.

His connection with Harvard dates from his own undergraduate days, and he has been a member of the faculty since 1903. Together with teaching, he has combined an active service in the hospitals of Boston, serving for nine years as chief of the medical staff at the Massachusetts General Hospital. He has also seen service in France with the Army Medical Reserve Corps, in which he was made a lieutenant-colonel in 1919.

Among his many notable works probably the most widely known to the layman has been *What Men Live By*. He here expounds brilliantly the formula of love, work, play, and worship as the indispensable prerequisites of the normal, happy life. In addition to a number of volumes related to medicine, Dr. Cabot has dealt with the problems of our social order in *Social Service and the Art of Healing* and *Social Work*. His latest book, *Adventures on the Borderlands of Ethics,* of which the accompanying chapter represents only a small portion, has stimulated the keenest interest and comment.

MINISTERING TO THE HANDICAPPED [1]

RICHARD C. CABOT

Ministers need to apply their religious beliefs in the attempt to encourage, to console, to steady human souls and to *learn from them* as well as from failures in attempting to help them. In his parish the young minister may fear to intrude upon the problems of his parishioners. But no one need fear to intrude in an almshouse if he goes there with the sincere desire to bring a little companionship and cheerfulness into lives that are often very lonely and depressed. Visitors to the old people in the almshouses, to the sick in hospitals, to the insane in asylums, are sorely needed. . . .

In doing this, ministers would learn how to scrape acquaintance of all sorts and races of men, women, and children, while practising their powers of amusing, cheering, interesting, encouraging, consoling, instructing a patient and of passing on to him the spiritual dynamic by which Christians live.

[1] The reader is referred to Dr. Cabot's stimulating book, *Adventures on the Borderlands of Ethics,* published by Harper & Brothers, from which this chapter is quoted. It is hoped that this selection will be a stimulus to the reader to secure the volume.

The minister would be of peculiar value to the patients and to the institution, because, having learned to appreciate the value of medical and surgical aid, he would also learn its signal limitations. He would see what doctors and nurses are peculiarly blind to and so would bring in a fresh kind of helpfulness, supplementing but not opposing the medical régime.

No one who has not lived long in hospitals can know how much this extra-medical vision and service is needed there. Not cruelty or callousness but an amazing blindness is the curse of these institutions. With rare and blessed exceptions, nurses, doctors, and hospital superintendents all succumb to it. Even social workers cannot always keep clear of it.

Not all my readers, I imagine, are aware that a hospital is almost certain to rise to a better standard of usefulness to its patients and to attain strikingly higher standards—both technical and humanitarian —when medical students and medical teachers become a part of its organization and help to carry on its daily work. Most hospital superintendents know this and maneuver by all the means in their power to get and hold connection with a medical school.

This is at first hard to believe. One's first thought is of the interference of students, prone to "experiment" on patients, bungling and callous, invading privacy and modesty by their prying curiosity and their ignorant examinations.

There is a certain measure of justification for such fears. But on the whole and in the long run

there is no question that medical students and medical teachers focus upon the central tasks of diagnosis and treatment an amount of energy and conscientiousness that cannot be attained without their presence. There is less carelessness on the part of nurses and doctors, less neglect, fewer blunders, less reliance on antiquated and useless methods. Criticism and inquiry are in the air. One has to justify one's ways and convince others. One cannot conceal one's shortcomings of patience, one's laziness, one's petty tyranny, one's inhumanity and selfishness—or, rather, it is much harder to do so—when the results of one's work have to be shown to students and described in lectures as good examples of modern science, or now and then as awful examples of modern blundering. With such possibilities in view, people brace up and "watch their step." They may even catch the inspiration and the current of better ways and be transformed inwardly as well as outwardly.

I have described all this in detail because I believe that another and as great a hoisting of standards will take place in these great institutions where suffering humanity is to a considerable extent at the mercy of those set to care for them, when the clergy, as well as the medical profession, has asked for its chance to learn and to serve in hospitals, asylums, and almshouses.

What is the minister or the theological student to do in these institutions? He is to look after the minds, the emotions, the wills, the souls of the in-

mates as the doctors and nurses now care for their physical welfare. Against this doctors and nurses will certainly insist that they are already caring for the whole patient, body and soul. But just as certainly they are not doing so. Their attention is too strongly concentrated on the excessively difficult and delicate tasks of diagnosis and treatment. There is not enough attention left to go round. In the purely medical job there is so much to remember, so much to puzzle over, so much to construct and invent, that very few physicians or surgeons have any fresh attention left to give to such problems as: What is this man thinking about? How is he occupied when I, his physician, am not here? How does he get on with those who care for his daily physical needs (nurses, ward-tenders, attendants)? What in his past and in his future is he worrying about? How do his domestic and his economic ties enter into the attitude with which he is now facing his illness and the decisions (operation, convalescent home, change of work) which it involves? Has he any recreation, any refreshment, anything to occupy his thoughts and his hands, anything to make his days seem to him worth while? Does he have any reason to believe that those engaged in caring for him have a *personal* interest in him (not merely a professional or diffused interest)?

His physician may retort that the patient is too sick to think of any of these things and would be worse, not better, if any one (especially a clergy-

man) forced him to think of them. In some diseases —such as typhoid fever, meningitis, the somnolent or the maniacal phases of insanity, facial neuralgia with sharp pain—this contention is entirely just. The patient's body is then all that we can care for. His soul is not in evidence. But such cases form a small minority of those in any great institution. For the majority there is a great deal to be done, which doctors and nurses neglect or have no time for, but which the minister and the theological student can perfectly well fit themselves to do, and which cryingly needs to be done.

This is especially true of our great public institutions for the insane. Ordinarily hospitals for the sick are invaded by a good many persons who prevent the abuse of patients. Friends and relatives may be there almost every day; women visit the wards in the afternoon; social workers are on hand; and even the presence of medical students (as I have said) tends to keep up standards, primarily of physical care, but also of humane treatment. But in hospitals for the insane, there are few visitors, few social service workers, very few medical students. Most of the attendants and nurses receive very low pay; and this fact, combined with the disagreeableness and hopelessness of the job, and sometimes with the element of real danger in it, makes it rarely possible to obtain attendants of a caliber such as to insure their giving the patients considerate and compassionate care. In a few wards of a few hospitals, the presence

of "occupational aides" (i.e., teachers of handicrafts) has begun to lessen the evils that are otherwise inevitable.

Now and then we hear stories of terrible abuse of the insane by their attendants in public hospitals. Such abuses are quite unavoidable so long as the salaries paid to attendants and the quarters and opportunities given them are what they are. Even at the best, the task of attendants in a public hospital for the insane is hard, thankless, monotonous, discouraging in the extreme. The type of attendant to be obtained under present conditions can rarely face such a job without becoming hardened and inattentive, if not cruel.

In my belief the only persons who can be relied upon to face such terrible work continuously and yet to retain their best human qualities are persons of a dedicated life, persons who feel the call to serve their fellows as the first thing in life; reason sufficient for happiness when such service is found, whether there are any of the ordinary rewards that men strive for or not. Such a body of persons is more often found in the clergy and in the religious orders than anywhere else that I know.

TRANSLATING CHRISTIANITY INTO THE DAILY COMMUNITY LIFE

JEROME DAVIS

Jerome Davis was born in Japan of American parents. His father, after having a share in freeing the slaves as a colonel in the Civil War, helped to found the largest Christian university in Japan, Doshisha.

In spite of the handicap of a foreign schooling, Jerome Davis finished his college course in three years at Oberlin. For a short time he worked with the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, and then began his training for the ministry.

For three years during the war, Mr. Davis was in Russia, first in charge of 150,000 prisoners in Turkestan, and later in charge of the Y.M.C.A. war work. At the end of the world conflict he returned to America, speaking widely against intervention in Russia.

On concluding his course at Union Theological Seminary he was awarded the Gilder Fellowship at Columbia University and thus had the opportunity to secure his Ph.D. In 1921 he again visited Russia on an emergency relief mission, returning in the autumn to take up his duties at Dartmouth as assistant professor of sociology. In 1923 he made an investigation into the human side of mining conditions in West Virginia for a report which was presented to the Federal Coal Commission. In 1924 he was appointed head of the Social Service Department at Yale University. In 1926 he was again in Russia, making an investigation for a group of American business men and writing articles for syndication in the United States. In 1927 he went into Russia with Mr. E. A. Filene of Boston and other business leaders, also acting as technical adviser for a labor delegation, and his articles were syndicated throughout the United States.

Mr. Davis is the author of *The Russians and Ruthenians in America, The Russian Immigrant, Business and the Church,* and *Introduction to Sociology,* as well as editor of the *Social Relations Series* published by D. C. Heath & Company and contributing editor of *Social Forces.*

TRANSLATING CHRISTIANITY INTO THE DAILY COMMUNITY LIFE

JEROME DAVIS

Life itself could be transformed into a brilliant adventure, yet how often we squander and dribble it away in fleeting nonenities which leave us cold and ashamed at the end! Christianity, if it is to have vital power, should keep calling us back to the heroic, challenging us with the deeper meanings of life, and so make adventurous romances of the commonplace.

We are so largely the threefold product of heredity, of our geographic and of our social environments, including the entire cultural pattern of our social set, that we often tend to lapse into the quest of false idols, even in spite of idealism. Money, social standing, fashion, the fleeting pleasures of the moment, all claim their quota of victims. Perhaps the majority of people drift lazily through existence without even sensing much of what is really the highest and noblest happiness.

Now, Christianity attempts to keep calling men back to spiritual standards and spiritual adventures. After all, the highest values are the intangibles.

Beauty, happiness, love, friendship, good-will, daring, sacrifice, can none of them be weighed.

While organized Christianity recognizes this in theory, in practice it too is immersed in the concrete affairs of our time. It wishes to be "successful" as men rate "success." Salaries, budgets, members, and church buildings are measures of achievement. In consequence, there is a danger that the church will talk vigorously and often about love, brotherhood, and the Golden Rule, but fail to make them concrete in the local community.

The widely flaunted controversy between the Fundamentalists and the Liberals is passing into the oblivion where it belonged. The fundamental conflict of our time is between our ideals and our lives, our loyalties and our actions. The moral life of a Harry Emerson Fosdick may be no different from that of a William Jennings Bryan. Hence, rather than divide believers into two groups of Fundamentalists and Modernists, we ought rather to divide "Christians" into those who are *living* the Jesus way day by day and those who are simply mouthing their loyalty.

One way for Christians or churches to keep from falling victims to this abstract ideology is for them to take part in concrete local efforts to meet social need. This, of necessity, involves coöperating with social agencies. One Episcopal church in Bridgeport, Connecticut, is making an interesting experiment. It has definite committee chairmen coöperating with

the social agencies, and each church member is expected to report annually on at least one social act of service.

The chief danger confronting social work is that it will be opportunistic and ameliorative, in fact, a mere palliative, rather than a radical transformer of the existing economic structure. Social work has at various times and by various people been defined as:[1]

An offensive attempt on the part of protected privilege to drug the ethical stimulus of the people and make them acquiescent in the continuance of privilege.

A slow encroachment of socialism, a sucking of the life-blood of individualism, an insinuating, softening influence upon the sterling old qualities that make a man proud of his capacity to carry his own load.

Social work, by salvaging the unfit, the physical and mental weaklings, flies in the face of nature's laws which would automatically shelve the incompetent.

A series of fads evolved in the heads of sentimental busybodies.

While these definitions are extreme, social agencies do need prophetic Christian voices calling them back from a mere relief of pain instead of its prevention, from the mere salvaging of damaged souls while all the time parts of our economic structure are ceaselessly grinding out these same victims by the wholesale.

[1] See presidential address of W. J. Norton, National Conference of Social Work, 1925.

The church needs the concrete application which the social agency offers, and the latter needs Christianity to make it really revolutionary and spiritual. Each without the other is in danger of losing its soul.

Christianity must be a moral and spiritual dynamic. We commonly assume that the church is a generator of spiritual force, but the crucial question is what is done with this power. Does it lie idle, is it stored up within the individual to find expression merely in a happy family, or is it translated so as to add its quota to greater justice, beauty, and brotherhood *for all*—in short, a happier nation?

In order to adventure, it is necessary not only to do the usual forms of social work, but to pioneer into realms which are new and untried. Organized Christianity must stand as a sort of moral fire department, ready to throw its good-will and its passion for righteousness against any threatening community evil. We can do this only if we practise the principle of experimental truth-finding, and then we shall discover that, irresistibly, more and more truth will break out of God's world. Each church and each individual should know something definite about the following decalogue of community needs: first, the realities of the local government, the facts regarding bossism; second, industry; third, health and the problems of sex; fourth, education; fifth, recreation; sixth, housing; seventh, the immigrant and his family; eighth, the dependent; ninth, the delinquent; and

tenth, the defective. Every one ought to know what to do as a voter, a taxpayer, a married person, a parent, a member of a church and of a community. No citizen will be a master in all of these fields, but each should be familiar with outstanding community needs. This volume has endeavored to point out ways and means of pioneering in these realms.

The thoughtful reader should now see clearly that, instead of being so much concerned about saving our own little souls, we should rather throw our strength into coöperating to change our communities for the better, and then our own salvation comes as a by-product. Indeed, unless we are attempting to reconstruct our social order, we can scarcely be sure of saving ourselves. For we are all unconscious partners in the sins of our own communities. Each one of us tends to adopt the standards of his set without being aware of the disastrous concomitant effects which this produces both on himself and on some other group. For instance, how hard it is for men to seek the life more abundant while subjected to the twelve-hour day (still existent in 1927) or the constant threat of unemployment! How difficult it is for a child to be saved when he is immersed in city slums which condemn him to tuberculosis, rickets, and the moral leprosies of city filth! Women have an almost impossible time following Christ when they are submerged in a social group which looks at fashions and material comforts as of primary importance. Ministers and social workers are in danger

when surrounded by boards of trustees who practise "the conventional moralities."

The great socialist leader, Debs, has expressed this eloquently: "Years ago I recognized my kinship with all living beings, and I made up my mind that I was not one bit better than the meanest of the earth. I said then, and I say now, that while there is a lower class I am in it, while there is a criminal element I am of it, while there is a soul in prison I am not free."

From the decalogue of waiting community adventures, let us consider two ways in which Christianity is offered a challenging and neglected opportunity to transmit present power. Take the matter of our jails. They are, on the average, institutions for keeping vile men apart rather than for making better men. Joseph Fishman, for many years the only inspector of prisons for the federal government, defines a jail as he found it in eighty-five per cent. of the cities and towns throughout the United States as:

> An unbelievably filthy institution in which are confined men and women serving sentence for crimes and men and women not under sentence who are simply awaiting trial, with few exceptions having no segregation of the unconvicted from the convicted; usually swarming with bedbugs, roaches, lice, and other vermin; has an odor of disinfectant and filth which is appalling; supports in complete idleness countless thousands of able-bodied men and women, and generally affords ample time and opportunity to assure in-

mates a complete course in every kind of viciousness and crime.

The American Prison Association in 1925 urged that the United States Government establish a jail system of its own for federal prisoners because, as they said:

It is a fact well known to all who have given careful study to the subject that the county jails of the United States are breeding places and schools of vice, and that there is no more prolific source of crime.

In New Haven our jail is far above the average, but we have been unwilling to leave the problem untouched. A graduate student was appointed to give half his time to the prisoners at a salary of five hundred dollars for the school year. At the start of the work we held a mass meeting with all the prisoners. Each one was supplied with paper and pencil and asked to indicate his idea of possible improvements and whether he cared for a personal interview. The replies ranged all the way from requests for more adequate medical service to night classes and evening debates. Acting on these results, in cooperation with the management, we established, besides an early morning service, a second devotional meeting each Sunday morning with special musical features. We also equipped a more adequate library with two prisoners in charge. The only books with which most jails are provided are old, dilapidated,

and for the most part worthless. They have usually been taken from the rubbish corners of the homes of the generous. We bought new books and collected one thousand others, of which half had to be discarded. We started an educational forum, classes in English, civics, spelling, and arithmetic, and finally, and most important of all, did personal work for the men. This involved interviews, writing letters, doing special errands for them outside the jail, securing work for them when they left, and being a friend against old temptations and old associations which pull down. Here, for instance, is John, a habitual drunkard. Again and again he has returned to jail, the victim of evil associates whom he cannot seem to avoid. John is provided with a room and a job with close friendly contact. Once he is back in jail, but finally is encouraged to break with his past and ever since has been going straight.

Here is H——, a man waiting trial. He says he will go crazy if he cannot have something to do. Conference and investigation prove he had been foolish in borrowing the car of a friend, but was innocent of theft. He is released by the court and is making good as a salesman. Some cases of the innocent who have been cruelly wronged are uncovered. There are still more cases of the guilty who are products of bad economic and social conditions. Because they are poor they are held in jail for offenses which are easily settled by those of wealth. For instance, one girl in her teens, already a

mother, was accused of burning down an old shed in which she lived to collect insurance so as to provide food for her baby. For eight long months she lay in jail, during which time the baby died, without having her case come to trial and with no lawyer. Finally she appealed to our worker.

Many inmates are found to be mentally deficient, but nearly all need friendship and spiritual help. It is not enough to have some volunteer merely conduct services in the jail. In the plan we are trying it is necessary to have both a paid minister and one who is young enough to understand the problems of the young men who make up most of the jail population. The coöperation of the jailer, the sheriff, and all the ministers of the community is naturally desirable. In order to inaugurate the plan and raise the money, some adventurous soul must be willing to pay the price of taking this matter on his mind and conscience—forcing the community to act, even if he has to advance the money himself. In New Haven the salary of the minister was assumed by the New Haven Council of Churches and by the Women's Association of the United Church. Some such experiment as has been described above should be in process in every county jail in America.

A second sorely neglected field is that of modern industry. This year the writer stood in the capital of Russia, face to face with the greatest challenge to organized Christianity which it has ever met. The charge was made that religion is authority super-

imposed upon the many by the few for the benefit of the few, that it is class superstition for the benefit of capitalists. We can recognize the essential falsity of this charge, and yet realize that it may have some element of truth for us.

Sociology teaches us that we can divide all groups on the basis of common work and economic status. It might prove valuable to classify so-called Christians in this way.

Exhaustive studies seem to indicate that the members of our Protestant Christian faith tend to belong to the white-collared class. The curious fact is that, while we claim to oppose the class spirit, all the time circumstances seem to separate us more and more from the lowest economic group. How far we have come from the old prophetic leadership in the Bible! There one finds the prophets frankly taking the side of the exploited classes against the rich. We are so surrounded by men who think as we do that we scarcely realize our class position. Have you ever been out on a moonlight night? One can walk for miles along the waterfront, and no matter where one goes the beams of moonlight always come his way. It is the same with our unconscious class bias. The truth always seems to shine at the point where we are. As a check on this tendency, we should ask ourselves: How much time do we spend with other classes? Specifically, what contacts do we make with the laboring group, for instance?

Certain evidences of this class tendency need presentation. First, from organized labor. It is hardly necessary to recall the Detroit incident where the Y.M.C.A., after inviting the head of the American Federation of Labor, a Baptist deacon, to speak, canceled his engagement at the bidding of some influential employers. President Green not long ago pointed out a church just across from his headquarters at Washington. There it stood, with its spires shining up toward the sun, directly facing the windows of the national offices of American labor. Yet the minister of that church had never entered the door of the building.

A friend in New Haven is to-day an ardent socialist. At one time he was a Sunday-school treasurer. He tried to get the president of the men's club of the church to sign a petition on the old age pension bill, but the latter even refused to read it. Another deacon was always fighting the labor-unions. My friend is no longer in the church, yet I know of few men who give more unsparingly of their time and energy for the common good.

Or take the testimony from the ministers. Bishop Spaulding, an Episcopalian, has said: "The church must cease being the hired charity agent of the rich and must become the champion of the poor." Dean Mathews says: "The church has always been a leader in charity. She has seldom been a leader in social reconstruction." President Coffin of Union Theological Seminary has said that we stand in

danger of having a class stratification of our churches. A Congregational minister, in the face of the Passaic strike, declared last year that Christians were socially blind. He says:

> We have men in the church, loyal to its services, pious in prayer and form, strenuous defenders of the Creed, fine, clean, winsome personalities in all their individual relationships, popular with their fraternity brothers, good fathers, faithful husbands, and yet stone blind to the human values in their factories, cold-hearted towards the needs of the men and women who work for them. . . . One thing stands out very clearly in my mind. There are two Passaics, and they are divided by railroad tracks. One is clean, tree-lined, beautifully homed. Americans in hours of highest idealism may well be proud of this Passaic. The second is dirty, its streets are narrow, its homes are dark, the narrow streets are full of little children. There are conditions here of work and play of which no true American can be proud. This is not what the fathers of the country sacrificed and died for. Here are stains on the flag, conditions of life crying aloud to God and to lovers of humanity for remedy. But the Protestant Churches sit contentedly on the beautiful hills of Passaic unmoved, offering no constructive leadership to these misled folk whom Christ came to seek and to save and to bring life, life more abundant.

Or take the testimony of business men. A prominent manufacturer in Baltimore says: "The suspicion in which the church is held as being an instrument of the master class is an outgrowth of her attempt to carry water on both shoulders. Before she can hope with any degree of success to become

the champion of the poor she must dispel this suspicion. The church must first completely declass herself."

President Hapgood of the Columbia Conserve Company says that he was able to get little or no coöperation in his efforts toward industrial brotherhood from the churches of Indianapolis. Golden Rule Nash lays down the thesis that actually the labor-unions of America have been more Christian in their practice, although they have largely failed to take Christ's name, than have the churches which bear his banner. It is hardly necessary to portray the other side. Any one who has read of the various forms of Christian adventuring in this volume will recognize that the church has been an agent of God even on behalf of the exploited classes.

The time has come when Christians must speak out more openly in favor of those who are exploited, of those who need help. Is it not time for the church definitely to strengthen and improve unionism? We must not rest content with individualistic, hell-dodging appeals.

It is obvious that there are bad unions. In West Virginia the writer stood at the mouth of mines which had been shot into by union men. Yet one must recognize that in the by and large the labor-unions throughout the United States are not only necessary but are a moral force. They have helped to bring the six-day week, shorter hours, and have championed a host of social policies all the way

from free education to accident compensation and the abolition of child labor. The United States Coal Commission found that it was the union which had been the potent force in improving the conditions of the miners. President Roosevelt in his autobiography gave it as the growing conviction of a lifetime that the trade-union is "one of the greatest possible agencies" in the attainment of true political democracy. He says that if he were a wage-earner of any sort he would immediately join the union. Unions have just as much right to exist as churches, a fact which is recognized by a leading banker of Los Angeles in the *Congregationalist*. He suggests an open-shop theory in religion as well as in industry. In other words, he believes that since labor organization is unnecessary, so is church membership—apparently a logical deduction from the theory and practice of many devotees of the open shop! On the other hand, the right to organize has been indorsed by the Federal Council of Churches and nearly every church denomination in our land. Is it not time for Christians really to help develop and better the leadership of the labor-unions, to stop criticizing without helping them?

It is easy to say the union cares only for money. From the vehemence with which some employers say this, one would suppose that they despised money and that profits were their last concern. As a matter of fact, labor-unions are not universally so grasping as one might suppose. There are unions

which have voluntarily reduced wages ten per cent. Trade-unions often adopt resolutions in favor of applying Jesus' principles. For instance, the Ohio Valley Trades and Labor Assembly said: "We do hereby declare it to be our belief that the teachings of Christ constitute a platform on which all men could agree."

What, then, must the church do in this industrial situation? It must do precisely what we have already described. First, it must be an experimental truth-finder. It must know the local industrial situation, the wages, the hours, the dividend rates, and the labor leaders. Second, it must educate the employer. This involves creating a good-will power, not a *don't* power. We must definitely preach social righteousness and all that it involves. It may be possible to meet with two or three employers weekly for lunch to discuss the ethical problems of industry. This could well educate the minister as much or more than the employer. In many places adult men's classes have been organized for the discussion of local industrial conditions.[1]

[1] A symposium issued last year by The Century Co., entitled *Business and the Church,* might be used as a text. It contains the policy of creating industrial good-will which twenty captains of industry and labor leaders have worked out in the thick of the daily grind. There are chapters by such leaders as Henry Ford, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Roger Babson, John Calder, Golden Rule Nash, and others. There are now available questions on every chapter which can be sent to any discussion leader who uses the volume.

Finally, Christians must work with and for the labor-unions. In New Haven we suggested to the New Haven Trades Council that we should turn one of their regular monthly meetings into a forum with an outside speaker. At first they thought this was a clever scheme for either socialistic, denominational, or capitalistic propaganda. Actually they found it increased the attendance at their meetings, and it became so popular that the idea is spreading throughout the State.

This past year, in addition to forum and classes for laboring men, we held three large mass meetings for labor under the auspices of the trade-unions at which all the ministers of the community were invited to participate. Each one was opened and closed by prayer given by both Catholics and Protestants, and an average of thirty ministers sat on the platform.

The first meeting was addressed by President William Green of the American Federation of Labor, the second by Dean Charles R. Brown, and the third by Senator William E. Borah.

As Christians we dare not ignore organized labor any more than we can leave untouched the commercial groups in Rotary clubs. Both need to be called back to the service of God and of men. Traditional church work is not enough. We must go out actively as Christ did in the spirit of flaming love, ready to serve labor and capital, and this leads inevitably to factory and labor-union.

To-day America still faces the grave danger that we shall serve Mammon as God under the guise of a benevolent prosperity. Still huge areas of industry do not have even a semblance of democracy, either in finance or in employee representation. Professor Ripley of Harvard has made clear the one condition, and the United States Industrial Relations Commission the other. Yet autocratic industry breeds autocratic action, and autocratic action breeds conflict.

The law of love and the fatherhood of God demand organization for labor. Employers must keep asking themselves what changes would result if they were really to act on the principle that every employee was their son. Let us bring every problem, every individual, face to face with the dynamic love of Jesus. Let us begin now to translate our theoretical love for the working-man into action, begin now to really build the industrial order over according to the blue-print of Jesus.

Every individual Christian and every church must be a social and civic dynamic force, transforming the local community toward a Kingdom of God on earth, so making a real Christianity of social adventuring.

BT
738
D37

Davis, Jerome, 1891– *ed.*
Christianity and social adventuring, edited and with an introduction by Jerome Davis. New York & London, The Century co. [c1927]
xii, 373 p. 20½cm. $2.50

1. Sociology, Christian. 1. Title.
Library of Congress BR115.S6D3
27—23321

CCSC/ss

334776